

तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

SANTINIKETAN  
VISWA BHARATI  
LIBRARY

905

A.O.R

V. 6











# ANNALS OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH

UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS

*Editor-in-Chief*

DR. S. MUHAMMAD HUSAYN NAINAR

*Editorial Board*

MR. S. VAIYAPURI PILLAI

MR. M. MARIAPPA BHAT

MR. K. RAMAKRISHNAYYA

DR. C. ACHYUTA MENON

DR. C. KUNHAN RAJA



# Annals of Oriental Research

## EDITORIAL BOARD

DR. S. MUHAMMAD HUSAYN NAINAR  
(EDITOR-IN-CHIEF)

*Head of the Dept. of Arabic, Persian  
and Urdu*

RAO SAHEB S. VAIYAPURI PILLAI ..	„	Tamil
MR. K. RAMAKRISHNAYYA ..	„	Telugu
MR. M. MARIAPPA BHAT ..	„	Kannada
DR. C. ACHYUTA MENON ..	„	Malayalam
DR. C. KUNHAN RAJA ..	„	Sanskrit

*Published by the University of Madras*

*Twice a year*

**Annual subscription Rs. Four**

## CONTENTS

### PAGES

#### TAMIL :

Change of Consonants

*By V. Venkata Rajulu Reddiar*

.. 1- 12

#### TELUGU :

Dravidian Phonetics

*By K. Ramakrishnayya*

.. 1- 24

#### KANNADA :

Āṇḍayya

*By M. Mariappa Bhat*

.. 1- 16

On Pampa's Works

*By H. Sesha Ayyangar*

.. 49- 72

#### MALAYALAM :

Death of Odēnan

*By Dr. Chelnat Achyuta Menon*

.. 1- 15

Dhvanyālōka—Identity of Authorship

*By P. Krishnan Nair*

.. 1- 18

#### SANSKRIT :

Notes on Kālidāsa

*By Dr. C. Kunhan Raja*

.. 1- 32

Some Appayya Dīkṣitas

*By Dr. V. Raghavan*

.. 1- 4

Minor Works Wrongly ascribed to Ādi Śankara

*By Dr. V. Raghavan*

.. 5- 8

#### ARABIC, PERSIAN AND URDU :

Tuḥfat-al-Mujāhidīn

*By S. Muhammad Husayn Nainar*

.. 1-112



# CHANGE OF CONSONANTS

By

V. VENKATA RAJULU REDDIAR,

*Junior Lecturer in Tamil*

Phonetic changes of certain consonants in *Sandhi*, due to assimilation, are dealt with in this short paper. It is also shown, by examples, that such changes enable us to arrive at a correct etymology.





# மெய்யெழுத்துக்களின் திரிபு

By

V. VENKATA RAJULU REDDIAR,  
Junior Lecturer in Tamil.

தமிழ்மொழியில் உள்ள மெய்யெழுத்துக்கள் பதினெட்டும் வல்லெழுத்து, மெல்லெழுத்து, இடையெழுத்து என மூன்று வகையாகப் பிரிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. ஒவ்வொரு வகையிலும் ஆறு ஆறு எழுத்துக்கள் உள்ளன. எல்லா மெய்யெழுத்துக்களும் ஒன்றோடொன்று சேர்ந்தொலித்தல் இல்லை. அதனால், இன்ன-மெய்யெழுத்து இன்னமெய்யெழுத்தோடு மயங்கிநிற்கும் என்று இலக்கண நூல்கள் வரையறை செய்திருக்கின்றன. அதன்படி, வல்லெழுத்துக்களுள் க ச த ப நான்கும் வே ரெந்தமெய்யெழுத் தொடும் மயங்கிநிற்றல் இல்லை; ர முக்கள் இரண்டும் தம்மொடு தாம் கூடிநிற்றல் இல்லை; ஏனைய பன்னிரண்டெழுத்துக்களும் தம்மொடும் பிறமெய்களொடும் மயங்கிநிற்கும். அவ்வாறு மயங்கி-நிற்குமியல்பு இல்லாத மெய்கள் வேறு பெய்களாகத் திரியும். அங்கனம் திரிபவை மெல்லெழுத்துக்களுள் ம், ண், ன் இம் மூன்றும், இடையெழுத்துக்களுள் ல், வ், ள் இம் மூன்றும் என்பது இலக்கண நூல்களான் அறியப்படும்.

மகரம்—தனக்குமுன் க ச த க்கள் வரும்போது, அவற்றின் இனமெல்லெழுத்துக்களாகிய ற ஞ ந க்களாகத் திரியும். ஞ ந க்கள் வரும்போது அவ்வெழுத்துக் களாய்த் திரியும்.

ணகரம்—தனக்குமுன் க ச த ப க்கள் வரும்போது டகரமாய்த் திரியும்.

னகரம்—தனக்குமுன் க ச த ப க்கள் வரும்போது றகரமாய்த் திரியும்.

லகரம்—க ச த ப க்கள் வரும்போது றகரமாய்த் திரியும்;

• தகரம் வரும்போது ஆய்தம் ஆதலும் உண்டு. ஞ ந ம க்கள் வரும்போது னகரமாகும்.

வகரம்—க ச த ப க்கள் வரும்போது ஆய்தமாய்த் திரியும்; ஞ ந ம க்கள் வரின் அம் மெய்யெழுத்துக்களாய்த் திரியும்.

ளகாரம்—க ச த ப க்கள் வரும்போது டகரமாய்த் திரியும்; .  
தகாரம் வரும்போது ஆய்தமாதலும் உண்டு. ரு ந  
ம க்கள் வரும்போது ணகாரமாய்த் திரியும்.

தகார நகாரங்கள், மேல்நிற்கும் எழுத்திற் கேற்பத் திரிதல் உண்டு. இவையே இலக்கியங்களிலும் காணப்படுகின்றன. ஆயின், சொற்களின் முதலிலைகளைக் கண்டறியுமிடத்து, மேற் கூறப்படாத திரிபுகளும் நேர்ந்துள்ளது புலனாகின்றது.

மெய்யெழுத்துக்கள் திரிதற்கு முக்கிய காரணம்— நிலைமொழி வருமொழி இரண்டினையும் ஒருசொற்போன்று பிளவுபடா தொலித்தலாகும். ஒலித்தலின் எளிமையினாலும் திரிதல் உண்டு.

தண் என்பதனையும் நீர் என்பதனையும், பிளவுபடாமல் தண்ணீர் என்று ஒலித்தல் இயலாது; தண்ணீர் என்று ஒலித்தல் கூடும். பிளவுபடக் கூறின், தண் நீர் என்று ஒலிக்கலாம். வடமொழியில் ஷட் என்பதன் திரிபாகிப் ஷண் என்பதனொடு நவதி என்பதனைச் சேர்த்து ஒலிக்குமிடத்து, நவதி என்பதன் நகாரம் ணகாரமாய்த் திரிந்து ஷண்ணவதி என்று ஒலிப்பது ஈண்டு ஒப்பிடத்தக்கது. அடித்தான், பிடித்தான் என்பவற்றில் தகரமெய்க்கு மேல்நிற்கும் இகரம் இடையண்ணத்திற் பிறப்பதாகலின், பல்லினடியிற் பிறக்குந் தகாரத்தை அந்த இகரத்தோடு ஒலித்தல் அருமையும், அதனை இகரம் பிறக்கின்ற இடையண்ணத்திற் பிறக்குஞ் சகரமாக ஒலித்தல் எளிமையும் ஆகலின், அத் தகாரத்தைச் சகரமாக வழக்கில் வழங்குகின்றனர். அடித்தான் என்பதில் இகரமும் தகரமும் ஒருங்கொலித்தற்கு இயலாதனவல்ல; ஒலித்தலின் எழுப்பத்தானே தகாரம் திரிந்தது. இவ்வாறே வலைநர், அரிநா என்னுஞ் சொற்களிலும் நகாரம் ருகாரமாய்த் திரிந்து ஒலிக்கின்றது.

தமிழில் வல்லெழுத்துக்கள், முற்காலத்தில் சொற்களில் எல்லாவிடத்தும் வல்லோசையவாய் ஒலிக்கப்பட்டனவாகும். அஃதாவது, க ச ட த பக்கள் வடமொழியில் உள்ள க ச ட த பக்கள் ஒலித்தல்போன்று ஒலிக்கப்பட்டன. நகரம், டகரவொலியினை ஒட்டிய ஒலியாய் ஒலிக்கப்பட்டது. பின்னர், க ச ட த பக்கள் சொற்களில் இரட்டித்துவருமிடம் ஒழிய, மற்றையவிடங்களில் தம் பழைய ஒலியை இழந்தன; பெரும்பாலும் வடமொழியில் வருக்கவெழுத்துக்களுள் மூன்றாமெழுத்தின் ஒலியைப் பெறலாயின. நகாரம் இரட்டிக்குமிடத்திற்றாலும் தனது இயல்பான் ஒலியை உடையதா

1. நவதி என்பது ணவதி என்று திரிந்தபின், ஷட் என்பது ஷண் எனத் திரியும் என்று இலக்கணம் கூறும்.

யில்லை. மெல்லெழுத்துக்களுள் நகாரம் நன்கு. ஒலித்தல் இல்லை. இடையெழுத்துக்களுள் ரகர முகரங்கள் பெரும்பாலும் சரியா யொலித்தல் இல்லை. இத்தகைய ஒலிவேறுபாட்டானும் சில திரிபு நேர்த்துள்ளன.

இடையெழுத்துக்களெல்லாம் பல்வேறு வகையாகத் திரிந்தும் கெட்டும் வழக்கில் வழங்குகின்றன; செய்யுளுள்ளும் பல காண் கின்றன. அவற்றை நோக்குவோம்: முதற்கண், எல்லாரும் ஒரு- தலையா யுடன்படுந் திரிபினையுடைய சொற்களைக் குறிக்கின்றேன்.

1 நெருநல்	—	2 நென்னல்
3 பெருமான்	—	4 பெம்மான்
5 ஒருத்தன்	—	6 ஒத்தன்

நெருநல் முதலியவை நென்னல் முதலியனவாக நேரே திரியா. நெருநல் என்பது நெர்நல் என்றாகி, பின்னர், நெந்நல்—நென்னல் என்றாகியிருத்தல் வேண்டும் என்று தோன்றும். ஆயின், பழங் கன்னடமும் தெலுங்கும் நோக்கின், நெர்நல் என்பதுபோன்றவையே பழமைய என்பதும், தமிழில் உகரம் சேர்த்துளது என்பதும் புலனாகும். நெர்நல், பெர்மான், ஒர்தன் என்பவற்றில் வேற்றுநிலை மெய்யயக்காராயிருந்த ரகாரம் தன் முன்னின்ற மெய் யாகத் திரிந்துளது என்பது நன்கறியப்படும். பழங்கன்னடத்தில் வேற்றுநிலைமெய்யயக்கா யிருந்த ர முகரங்கள் தம் முன்னிற்கும் எழுத்தாகத் திரிந்து புதுக்கன்னடத்தில் வழங்குகின்றன. உதாரணமாக—

பழங்கன்னடம்		புதுக்கன்னடம்
எர்து	—	எத்து
உர்து	—	உத்து
பிர்து	—	பித்து
மர்து	—	மத்து
அழ்கே	—	அக்கே
கழ்தே	—	கத்தே
பழ்தி	—	பத்தி (ஹத்தி)
பொழ்து	—	பொத்து (ஹொத்து)

- |  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| 1. குறள். 336.   | 3. பெருங்கதை. 42. 11.       |
| 2. திருப்பாலை. 16. நென்னல் என்பது தெலுங்கில் நீன்ன என்றும், கன்னடத்தில் நீன்னே என்றும், மலையாளத்தில் இன்னலே என்றும் வழங்குகின்றது, | 4. திருஞான. தேவா. 1. 127: 1 |
|  | 5. திருவாச. 29. 2.          |
|  | 6. கலித். 62.               |

இவ்வாறே ரகர முகரங்களெல்லாம் தம் முன்னிற்கும் எழுத்தாகத் திரிந்து புதுக்கன்னடத்தில் வழங்குகின்றன. புதுக்கன்னடத்தில், தனிச்சொல்லில் ரகர முகரங்கள் வேற்றுநிலைமெய்யக்கத்தனவா யிருத்தல் இல்லை.

மேற்காட்டியவற்றில் பழங்கன்னடச்சொற்கள் புதுக்கன்னடத் தில் திரிந்து வழங்குதல் போன்று, வடசொற்கள் பாகதத்தில் திரிந்து வழங்குகின்றன. உதாரணமாக—

வடசொற்கள்		பாகதச்சொற்கள்
அர்க :	—	1 அக்கோ
ஆர்த :	—	2 அத்தோ
கர்ணபூரம்	—	3 கண்ணனாரம்
கர்தரீ	—	4 கத்தரீ
கார்யம்	—	5 கய்யே
கீர்தி :	—	6 கித்தீ
நிர்மாதி	—	7 ணிம்மாண இ
நிவர்தக :	—	8 ணிவத்த ஓ
தீர்கம்	—	9 திர்கம்
தூர்த :	—	10 தூத்தோ
மூர்தி :	—	11 முத்தீ
வர்ண :	—	12 வண்ணே
வர்தமாநம்	—	13 வத்தமாநம்
வார்தா	—	14 வத்தா
வர்ம	—	15 வம்மோ

என்பன காண்க. வடசொற்களில் வேற்றுநிலைமெய்யக்கா யிருந்த ரகரம் தன் முன்னின்ற எழுத்தாய்த் திரிந்து பாகதமாய் வழங்கு கின்றது. இவ்வாறே லகரமும் தன் முன்னின்ற எழுத்தாய்த் திரிதல் உண்டு.

உல்கா — 16 உக்கா

1. ப்ராக்குதப்ரகாஸிகை. 3. 3	9. ப்ராக்குதப்ரகாஸிகை. 3.58
2. „ 3.24	10. „ 3.24
3. „ 4. 1	11. „ 3.24
4. „ 3.24	12. „ 4.15
5. „ 2. 7	13. „ 3.24
6. „ 3.24	14. „ 3.24
7. „ 8.36	15. „ 4.18
8. „ 3.24	16. „ 3. 3

இனி, இடையெழுத்துக்களையன்றிப் பிறவெழுத்துக்களும் இவ்வாறு திரிந்து வழங்கும். இவற்றையெல்லாம் ஈண்டு எடுத்துக்காட்டியதன் கருத்து, தமிழில் இங்கனம் திரிந்தன உள, அவ்வாறு திரிதல் இயல்பே என்பதனை வலியுறுத்தற்பொருட்டே எனக் கொள்க. இனி, தமிழ்ச்சொற்களை நோக்குவோம்:

மேல், வடசொற்களிலுள்ள ரகாரத்தின் திரிபினை அறிந்தோமாகலின், தமிழ்ச்சொற்களிலும் முதற்கண் ரகாரத்தின் திரிபினை அறிவோம்:

### சா த்து

சாத்து என்பது சாரச் செய் என்னும் பொருளில் வழங்குகின்றது. 'கதவு சாத்து' என்பதில் சாத்து என்னுஞ் சொல்லின் பொருளை நோக்குக. கு, சு, து முதலிய எழுத்துக்களை சுற்றிலுடையன பகுதிகளாய் வழங்கினும், அவற்றினுள் வேறொரு பகுதி அமைந்துளது என்னும் டாக்டர் கால்டுவெல்லின்கொள்கைப்படி, சாத்து என்பதனுள்ளும் பகுதி ஒன்று உளதாகும். அதன் பொருளை நோக்கின், சார் என்பது பகுதியாகும் எனப் புலனாகும். சார் + து = சாத்து. சாத்து என்பது மருவிச் சாத்து என்றாகியுளது. பேர்தி என்பது பேத்தி என்று வழங்குதல் ஈண்டைக்கு ஒப்பிடற்பாலது. நீத்தம் என்பது நீர் என்னுஞ் சொல்லினின்று அமைந்ததென்பது டாக்டர் கால்டுவெல் எழுதியிருப்பதனுடைய அறியலாகும். நீர் + து + அம் = நீர்தம்—நீத்தம். இச்சொற்களில், ரகாரம் தன் முன்னின்ற தகாரமாய்த் திரிந்துளது.

### பீச்சு

பீச்சு என்பது பால்கறத்தற் பொருளில் வழங்குகின்றது. இதில், சு—விசுதியாகு மாகலின், முதனிலை பீர் என்பது ஆகும். பீர் என்பது பால் என்னும் பொருளுடையது.

'பிரென்ப முலையிற் பாலும் பீர்க்கொடு பசுலைக்கும் பேர்' என்னும் நிகண்டு காண்க. பீர் + சு = பீர்சு—பீச்சு. இச்சொல் சிறிய தொலையையுடைய குழவினின்றும் நீரை வெளிவிடுதற் பொருளிலும் வழங்குகின்றது.

### ஒவ்வொன்று, இவ்விரண்டு

ஒவ்வொன்று என்பது ஒன்று என்னும் எண்ணப்பெயரொடு ஒன்று என்பது சேர்ந்து அமைந்தது. இவ்விரண்டு என்பதும் இவ்

வாதே இரண்டு இரண்டு என்னும் இரண்டு சொற்களால் ஆகியது. இவ் வெண்ணுப்பெயர்கள் தம்மொடு தாம் புணரின் இவ்வாறாகும் என்று தொல்காப்பியத்தில்<sup>1</sup> விதி கூறப்படவில்லை. ஆவர், ஒன்று இரண்டு என்பவை வேறு சொற்களொடு புணருமிடத்து ஒரு இரு என்பதாகும் என்று கூறியுள்ளார். அதுகொண்டு நோக்கின், ஒரு என்பதனொடு ஒன்று என்பது புணரும்புழி வகரவுடம்படுமெய் பெற்று ஒருவொன்று என்றாகும். ஒரோவொன்று என்னும் வழக்கு இருத்தலானும் இஃது அறியப்படும். ஒருவொன்று என்பதில் ரகரத்தொடு நின்ற உகரம் நன்கொலிக்காமற் கெட, <sup>2</sup>ஒர்வொன்று என்றாகும். ஒர்வொன்று என்பதிலே ஒவ்வொன்று என்று மருவியுளது என்பது மேற்கூறியவற்றான் எளிதிற் புலனாகும். இவ்வாதே இரு + இரண்டு என்பவை இருவிரண்டு என்று நின்று, பின்னர் இர்விரண்டு என்றாகி, இவ்விரண்டு எனத் திரிந்தனது. இச் சொற்கள் இவ்வாறாகற்கு நன்னூலார் விதி கூறியிருத்தலின், அவர்காலத்திற்குமுன்னரே இவற்றில் ரகரமெய் கெட்டதாகும். ரகரம் கெட்டதனை, 'இவ்விரண்டு' என்பதனைக் கேட்டவுடன் இரத்திரண்டு என்னும் பொருளே தோன்றுகின்றது. இவ்வாதே 'இவ்விருவர்' என்றாலும் இரத்திருவர் என்னும் பொருளே முதற்கண் எழுகின்றது. இருவிரண்டு, அல்லது இர்விரண்டு என்று வழங்கின் பொருள் தெளிவாகும்.

#### அவ்வாறு, வெவ்வேறு

அவ்வாறு என்னுள் சொல்லைக் கேட்டவுடன் 'அப்படி' என்னும் பொருளே தோன்றுகின்றது. இதற்கு, அறுஆறு என்னும் பொருளும் உண்டு. அப்பொருளில், அறு என்பதன் திரிபாகிய <sup>3</sup>அறு என்பதனொடு அறு என்னுள் சொல் சேர்ந்து அமைந்தது. அறு + ஆறு = அறுவாறு என்றாகும். அறு என்பதில் நகரத்தின் மேலூர்ந்த உகரம் கெட, அறுவாறு என்பது அற்வாறு அர்வாறு என்று நின்று, அவ்வாறு என்று மருவியுளது. கன்னடத்தில், நிலை மொழியீற்று நுகரத்தில் உகரம் கெடுதல் உண்டு. நுகரம் கெட்டவழி நகாரம் ரகாரம் ஆகும் என்று இலக்கணநூல்கள் கூறுகின்றன.

நேஸறு + மூடிதுது = நேஸர் மூடிதுது

என்பது காண்க. நேஸறு என்பது, தமிழில் நாயிறு (நூயிறு)

1. மருவின் பாத்திய என்பர். எழுத். 482.

2. ஓராயிரம், இராயிரம் என்று வழங்குதலை நோக்கின், ஓர்; இர் என்னும் வடிவமும் உண்டென்பது அறியப்படும்.

3. மூன்றும் ஆறும் நெடுமுதல் குறுகும் என்னும் விதி ஈண்டும் கொள்க.

என்று வழங்குஞ் சொல்லே. ஆகலின், அது றுவ்வீற்றதே என்பது துணிபு. இனி, தெலுங்கிலும்,

நூறு + நான்ளு = நூர் நான்ளு

என்றதல் உளது. ஈண்டு, நூறு என்பது தமிழில் நூறு என்று வழங்குமதுவே யாகலின், இதுவும் றுகரமுடையதே என்பதில் ஐயம் இன்று. இவற்றால், றுகரத்தில் உயிரெழுத்துக் கெடின் றகாரம் நன் கொலித்தல் இன்றி ரகாரமா யொலிக்கும் என்பது வலியுறும். ஆறு + ஆறு என்பவை அவ்வாறு என்றாகும் என்பதுவும் நன்னூலினுள் அறியப்படுகின்றது. ஆகலின், அவர்காலத்திற்கு முன்னரே இவ் வெண்ணுப்பெயர்த்தொகைச்சொல் பருவி வழங்கிற்று என்பது அறியப்படும்.

இனி, வெவ்வேறு என்பதும் வேறுவேறு என்னும் இரண்டு சொற்களால் ஆகியதுவே. ஆறு + ஆறு என்பவை அவ்வாறு என்றாகியவாறே வேறு + வேறு என்பவை வெவ்வேறு என்றாகியுள்ளன. வேறு என்பது முதல் குறுகி வேறு என்று நின்றல்<sup>1</sup> வெறுயிரம் என்பதனால் அறியலாகும். இதனை நோக்கின், எண்ணுப் பெயர்க்குக் கூறிய விதிப்போன்று இதற்கும் கூறுதல் வேண்டும் என்பது போதரும்.

தெலுங்கு கன்னடம் மலையாளம் இம்பொழிகளில் ஆறுஆறு, வேறுவேறு என்றை றகாரம் கெடாமல் இன்றளவும் வழங்குதல் அறிதற்பாலது. (கன்னடத்தில் பெற்றேபேறெ என்று வழங்கும். தெலுங்கில் வேர்வேறு என்றெழுதுதலும் உண்டு.)

ஆறு, வேறு என்னும் றுவ்வீற்றுச் சொற்கள் தட்மொடு தாம் புணர்வுழி, ஒரு, இரு என்னும் ருவ்வீற்றுச்சொற்களைப்போன்று அமைந்துற்றலின் அவ்வொற்றுமை கருதி அவை ஈண்டுக் குறிக்கப் பட்டன. இனி, மன்று என்னுஞ் சொல்லை நோக்குமோம்:

மன்று

மன்று என்பது வெளியிடம், அம்பலம் என்னும் பொருள் களில் வழங்குவது. அச்சொற்கு <sup>2</sup>ஆசிரியர் நச்சினார்க்கினியர், 'ஊர்க்கு நடுவாய் எல்லாரும் இருக்கும் மரத்தடி' என்று பொருள் கூறியுள்ளார். அதனை நோக்கின், மன்று என்பதன் முதல்வடிவம் மர்ன்று (மர்ன்று) என்பதுவே யாகும் என்பது புலனாகும். மர்ன்று (மர்ன்று) என்பது. மரனை உடையது என்னும் பொருளது

1. சீவக. 76. நச்சினார்க்கினியருரையான் வலியுற்றது.

2. திருமுருகாற். உரை.



அதனானே, நச்சினூர்க்கினியர் 'மரத்தடி' என்று பொருள் கூறினர். சிற்றூர்களில், வழக்குத் தீர்க்குந் தலைமக்கள், பல இனத்தவரும் வருதற் கேற்ற இடத்தில் மரத்தினடியில் இருந்து வழக்குக் கேட்பது வழக்கம். இஃது இன்றுஞ் சில ஊர்களில் உளது. அம் மரத்தின் அடியில் பெரும்பாலும் <sup>1</sup>திண்ணை கட்டியிருப்பர்.

மேற்கூறியவற்றால், ரகரமெய் கெடுதலும் உண்டு என்பது அறியப்படும். மருந்து என்று தமிழில் வழங்குஞ் சொல், பழங்கன்னடத்தில் மர்து என்று ரகரமெய்யொடு வழங்க, தெலுங்கில் மந்து என்று ரகரமெய் கெட்டு வழங்குதல் ஈண்டு ஒப்பிடத்தகும்.

மந்தை என்பது, ஊர்மாடுகள், மேய்ச்சலுக்குச் செல்லுந் துணையும் தங்கியிருக்கும் இடத்திற்குப் பெயராய் வழங்குகின்றது. இதுவும் மரன் என்பதனொடு தொடர்புடையதா யிருத்தல் வேண்டும். மரன் + து + ஐ = மரந்தை, மர்ந்தை = மந்தை. விசுதி வேறுபட்டின் பொருள் வேறுபடுமாகலின், மன்று, மந்தை என்பவை பொருளில் வேறுபட்டன. கொள்ளை, கொள்ளி, கொள்கை முதலியவை விசுதிவேறுபாட்டாற் பொருள் வேறுபட்டிருத்தல் காண்க.

இதுகாறும் கூறியவற்றால், ரகரமெய் தன் முன்னிற்கும் எழுத்தாய்த் திரிதலும், கெடுதலும் உண்டு என்பது அறியப்படும். இனி, ரகரத்தொடு பிறப்பொற்றுமையுடைய முகரத்தின் திரிபினை நோக்குவோம் :

#### அகப்பை, ஆப்பு, தாப்பாள்

அகப்பை என்பது அகழ் என்னும் முதனிலையடியின் அமைந்ததாகும். அகழ் + பு + ஐ = அகழ்ப்பை. முதலில் வழங்கிய டரவகப்பை மரக்கட்டையின் உள்ளிடத்தில் அகழ்ந்து செய்யப்பட்டதாகலின், அஃது அகழ்ப்பை என வழங்கப்பட்டது. அகழ்ப்பை என்னுஞ் சொல் அகப்பை என்று மருவி வழங்குகின்றது. இஃது, ஆப்பு என்னுஞ் சொல்லின் அமைதியினை நோக்கின் வலியுறும். பனை முதலியவற்றைப் பிளத்தற்கு, முதற்கண் அவற்றில் இடையிடையே ஆழ இடுகின்ற கூராய் முனையையுடைய சிறுகட்டையை ஆப்பு என்று வழங்குகின்றனர். ஆழ இடுதலின் அஃது ஆழ்பு எனப் பெயர் பெற்றது. ஆழ்பு என்பதுவே ஆப்பு என்று வழங்குகின்றது என்பது எளிதின் அறியப்படும். இனி, தாப்பாள் என்று வழங்குஞ் சொல்லை ஈண்டு

1. அத் திண்ணை வேயப்பட்டிருப்பின் பொதியில் (பொதிந்த இல்) எனப் பெயர் பெறும். அஃது ஒருவருக்கே உரியதன்றாகலின் பொதுவில் ஆகுமாயினும், பொதியில் என்பது பொதுவில் என்னுஞ் சொல்லின் திரிபன்று என்பது உளங்கொளற்பாலது.

ஒப்பிடுதல் தகும். <sup>1</sup>தாழ்பாள் என்பது தாப்பாள் என்று திரிந்துளது என்பது அதன் பொருளானே புலனாகும். இக் காட்டிய-வற்றிலெல்லாம் முகரம் தன் முன்னின்ற பகரமாய்த் திரிந்துளது. இனி, தாக்காட்டு என்பது தாழ்காட்டு என்பதன் திரிபு எனத் தோன்றுகின்றது. தாழ்—தாமதி. இவ்வாறாயின், முகரம் முன்னின்ற பகரமாய்த் திரிந்ததாகும்.

### முற்றம்

முற்றம் என்பது, ஸம்பூர்ணம் என்பதுபோல னுல்களில் இறுதியில் எழுதப்படும். 'நெய்தற்கலி முற்றம்' என்று கலித்தொகையில் எழுதியிருப்பது காண்க. இதன் பொருளை நோக்குமிடத்து, இது, முழுதும் என்னுஞ் சொல்லின் திரிபாகும் எனத் தோன்றுகின்றது. முழுதும்=முற்றம். பழங்கன்னடத்தில், கழ்தெ, பொழ்து என்று குறிலை யடுத்து முகரம் மெய்யாயிருத்தலின், அவ்வாறே பண்டைத் தமிழிலும் <sup>2</sup>குறில்வழி முகரமெய்யினை யுடைய சொற்கள் வழங்கின வாகலாம். அன்றேல், முழுதும் என்பதில் முகரத்தை ஊர்ந்து நின்ற உகரம் கெட்டது எனல் வேண்டும். இஃது எவ்வாறாயினும், முழுதும் என்பதுவே முற்றம் என்று திரிந்துளது என்பது தவறாகாது. ஈண்டு முகாரம், தகாரம் வந்தவழி லகாரம் திரிதல் போன்று, மகாரமாய்த் திரிந்துளது.

### புற்று

புற்று என்பது புழல், புழை என்பவற்றிற்கு முதனிலையாகிய புழ் என்பத னடியில் அமைந்ததாகும். புழ்+து=புற்று; புழை உடையது என்பது அதன் பொருள். பொழுது போழ்து, விழுது வீழ்து, முழுகு முழ்கு என்பனபோலக் குறில் நெடில் இரண்டும் ஒரு சொல்லின் முதற்க ணிற்றல் உண்மையின், அம் முறையில், புழ் என்றும் பூழ் என்றும் முதனிலை இருத்தல் கூடும். புழ் எனக் குறில்-வழி முகரமெய் வழங்காததனான், அது புழல் என விசுவாசம் பெற்று நின்றது. <sup>3</sup>பூழ் என்பது நெடில்முதலதாகலின், விசுவாசம் பெறாமலே வழங்கும்.

1. தாழ்பாளம் என்பது சரியான சொல்லாகும்.
2. 'ரகார முகாரம் குற்றெற் ருகா' என்னுஞ் சூத்திரத்தை நோக்கின், பண்டு குறில்வழி ரகர முகரம் உடையதாயிருத்திருத்தல் வேண்டும் என்பது போதருதல் கூடும்.
3. இஃது இடக்கர்ப்பொருளில் வழங்குகின்றது; அல்விசுவாசம் பெற்றும் இடக்கராய் வழங்கும்.

‘புழற்கா ளாம்பி’

(சிறுபாண். 134)

‘புரவ்வெம் பூக்கைதேர்’.

(கம்ப. முதற்போர். 58)

என்பவற்றில், புழல் பூழ் என்னுஞ் சொற்கள் அமைந்திருத்தல் காண்க. பூழ் என்னுஞ் சொல்லை நோக்கின், புழ் என்று மற்றொரு வடிவம் இருக்கும் என்பது போதருமன்றே?

### முட்டாள்

முட்டாள் என்பது முழ்தாள்(முழ்துஆள்) என்பதன் திரிபாகும். முழுஆள் என்பது முழுமகன் என்றபடி. முழுமகன் — அறிவில்லாதவன். கீழ்மகன் என்னும் பொருளிலும் வழங்கு கின்றது. ‘மோட்டிடத்துஞ் செய்யார் 1முழுமக்கள்’ என்னுமிடத்து, முழுமக்கள் என்பதன் பொருளை அறிக. இதனால் முழுமகன் என்பதும் முட்டாள் என்பதும் ஒருபொருளதேயாதல் அறிய லாகும். ஆகவே, முட்டாள் என்பதில், முகாரம் தகாரத்தொடு கூடிய-வழி டகாரமாய்த் திரிந்துள்ளமை போதரும். இவ்வாறாயின், முகாரம் தகாரத்தொடு கூடுமிடத்து (லகாரம்போன்று றகாரமாதலையன்றி), ளகாரம்போன்று டகாரமாதலும் உண்டென்று கொள்ளுதல் வேண்டும்.

இனி, முழ்தாள் (முழ்துஆள்) என்பது முற்றாள் என்றாகி, அது பின்னர் முட்டாள் என்று திரிந்தது எனினும் அமையும்.

### மங்கு, மண்ணை ; முங்கு

மங்குதல் என்பது மழுங்குதல் என்னும் பொருளது. இப் பொருளை நோக்கின், மங்கு என்பது மழுங்கு என்பதன் மருஉ என்பது புலனாகும். மழுங்கு என்பதில் கு—விசுதியாமாகலின், அதன் முதனிலை மழ் என்பது ஆகும் எனத் தோன்றுகின்றது. மழுங்கியது என்னும் பொருளில் வழங்குகின்ற மண்ணை என்னுஞ் சொல்லை நோக்கின், மழ் என்னும் முதனிலை உண்டென்பது அறிய லாகும். மழ் + ற் + ஐ = மண்ணை.

‘தாதிமுக மழுகிய மண்ணை வெண்கோட்டு’

என்னுமிடத்து, ‘மண்ணை வெண்கோடு—மழுமட்டையான கோடு’ என்று உரையாசிரியர் எழுதியிருப்பது காண்க. மழுங்கு என்பதே-யன்றி, மழுகு என்றும் வழங்குதல் உண்டு என்பது ஈண்டுக் கண்டாங். முழுகு என்னும் பொருளில் வழங்கும் முங்கு என்னுஞ் சொல்

1. ‘அறிவுபுக ஓர் புரை இல்லாத மக்கள்’. திரிகடுகம். 10. பழைய வுரை.

சண்டு ஒப்பிடற்பாலது. முழுகு என்பது நேரே முங்கு எனத் திரியாது. முழுகு என்பதில் முகரத்தை ஊர்த்துகின்ற உகரம் கெட்டு முழ்கு என்றாகும். முழ்கு என்பது முங்கு என மருவும். மங்கு (மழ்கு), முங்கு (முழ்கு) என்னும் இச் சொற்களை நோக்கின், முகாரம் முன்னின்ற ககரத்தின் இனமெல்லெழுத்தாய்த் திரிந்துளது என அறியலாகும்.

### தோண்டு

அடிமை என்னும் பொருளில் தொண்டு, தொழும்பு, தொழுத்தை என்னுஞ் சொற்கள் வழங்குகின்றன. தொழும்பு, தொழுத்தை என்னுஞ் சொற்களை நோக்கின், தொண்டு என்பதிலும் முகரம் இருத்தல் வேண்டும் என்பது தோன்றும். அன்றியும், அதில், டு(து)—விசுதியாகுமாகலின் அதனுள் முதனிலை இருத்தல் வேண்டும். இவற்றை உட்கொண்டு ஆராயின், தொழ் (தொழு) என்பதொரு முதனிலை உண்டென்றும், அதனொடு, து—சேர்ந்து தொண்டு என்றாயது என்றும் புலனாதல் கூடும். கன்னடத்தில் நோழ்து என்று வழங்குதல் சண்டு அறிதற்பாலது. தமிழில் பிழி என்று வழங்குஞ் சொல் தெலுங்கில் பிண்டு என்று வழங்குதலும் சண்டுக் கருதுதற்பாலதாகும்.

இதுகாறும் கூறியவற்றால், முகரமெய் தன் முன்னிற்கும் எழுத்திற்கியையப் பலவாறு திரியும் என்பது நன்கு விளங்கும். இனி, தனிநெடிலை யடுத்துநிற்கும் முகரம் கெடுதல் உண்டு. போது, பேகணி, தாவடம், வாவரசி (சுமங்கலி), கூவரகு முதலிய சொற்களைக் காண்க.

இனி, யகரத்தினைக்குறித்து ஆராய்வோம் :

### கொச்சகம்

கொச்சகம் என்பது <sup>1</sup>கொய்சகம் என்பதன் திரிபு என ஆசிரியர் நச்சுரைக்கணியருரையினால் அறியப்படுகின்றது. இதனை நோக்கின், இச்சொல்லில் யகரம் முன்னின்ற சகரமாய்த் திரிந்துளது எனப் போதரும்.

### கொத்து

கொத்து என்பது தானியமாகக் கொடுக்குங் கூலிக்குப் பெயராய் வழங்குகின்றது. பயிர்த்தொழிலில் நடுதல் களைபறித்தல் அறுவடைசெய்தல் முதலிய எல்லாத்தொழில்களிலும் வேலைசெய்தோருக்குத் தானியத்தையே கூலியாகக் கொடுக்கும் வழக்கம்

1. கொய்யகம் என்று யாழ்ப்பாணத்தில் வழங்குகின்றது.

இன்றும் உளது. வரகு கேழ்வரகு சோளம் கொள் முதலிய எல்லாப்பயிர்களையும் அறுவடை செய்தோருக்கு அவ் வத் தானியத் தையே <sup>1</sup>கூலியாகக் கொடுப்பர். இதனால், அவர்கள் கொய்த தானியத் தையே—கூலத்தையே—கொடுக்கும் முறை அறியப்படும். இவற்றை நோக்கின், கொத்து என்பது கொய்து என்பதன் திரிபாகும் என எளிதிற்புலனாகும். மலையாளத்தில், 'கொய்து' (கொய்த்து) என்பது அறுவடைக்குப் பெயராய் வழங்குகின்றது. யாழ்ப்பாணத்தில், கொத்து என்பது நாழிக்குப் பெயராய் வழங்குகின்றது. இவற்றையெல்லாம் ஒருங்கு நோக்கின், கொத்து என்பது கொய்து என்பதன் திரிபு என்பது துணியுலாகும். போய்ச் சேர்தல் என்னும் பொருளில் மலையாளத்தில் வழங்குகின்ற 'எத்தி' என்னுஞ் சொல் எய்து என்பதன் திரிபாகும். இதுவும் சுண்டு ஒப்பிடற் குரியதே.

### நத்து, நச்சு

விரும்பு என்னும் பொருளில் வழங்கும் நத்து என்னுஞ் சொல்லில், து—விருதியாகுமகலின், முதனிலை நய் (நய) என்பதாகும். நய + து = நய்து — நத்து. கயப்பு கய்ப்பு(கைப்பு) என்பவற்றை நோக்கின், நய நய என இரண்டு வடிவமும் இருத்தல் கூடும் என்பது போதரும். நயப்பு நய்ப்பு(நைப்பு) என்னும் இரண்டு சொற்கள் உண்மை இதனை வலியுறுத்துமன்றே?

யகரம் இடையண்ணத்திற் பிறப்பதாகலின், நய்து என்பதில் யகரத்தை அடுத்திருக்குந் தகாரம் அவ் யகாரம் பிறக்குமிடத்திற் பிறப்பதாகிய சகாரமாய்த் திரிந்தது. நய்து = நய்சு. நய்சு என்பது பின்பு நச்சு என்று திரிந்துளது. யகரமில்லாதிருப்பின், நத்து என்பது நச்சு எனத் திரியாது. கொத்து, கொச்சகம் என்பவையும், நத்து நச்சு என்பவையும் முறையே ஒப்பிடத்தக்கன. இவற்றால் யகரம் தன் முன்னிற்கும் எழுத்தாய்த் திரிதல் பெறப்படும்.

விரும்பு என்னும் பொருளையுடைய நம்பு என்பதுவும் நய் என்பதனினின்று அமைந்தது எனத் தோன்றுகின்றது. கொம்பு என்பது கொய் என்பதனினின்று அமைந்தது என்னுங் கால்-வெல்-ஆசிரியர்கூற்று இதனை வலியுறுத்தும். இவ்வாறாயின், யகரம் தன் முன்னிற்கும் வல்லெழுத்தின் <sup>2</sup>இனமெல்லெழுத்தாயும் திரியும் என்று கூறல் வேண்டும்.

1. கூலி என்பது கூலம் என்பதனினின்று அமைந்ததாகும்.
2. இத்தகைய சொற்களில் இனமெல்லெழுத்துத் தோன்றிற்று எனவும், அவ்வழி யகரம் கெட்டது எனவும் கொள்ளுதலும் கூடும்.

## DRAVIDIAN PHONETICS

By

K. RAMAKRISHNAYYA, M.A.,

*Head of the Telugu Department, University of Madras*

“The Development of ‘l’ in Dravidian Languages.”

This is one of the two sounds said to be peculiarly Dravidian, the other being the vallinum or the hard rough *r* as Dr. Caldwell puts it, or the Sakatarepha as it is called in Telugu. The sound ‘l’ is now preserved only in Tamil, Malayalam, and Badaga. It has gone out of use in Telugu and Kannada from the 11th and 13th Centuries A.D. respectively. In many words of Desya origin common to these languages, this sound ‘l’ changed into ‘r’ in Kannada and ‘ḍ’ in Telugu. It has also assumed various other forms in various words in these languages. Even in the Tamil country its pronunciation is said to be different in different places. Though it is generally represented according to Dr. Caldwell by the English sound ‘*rz*h’, which pronunciation is perhaps preserved in the middle country between Tanjore and Pondicherry, in the Southern districts it is pronounced as ‘r’ as mostly in Kannada and nearer Madras it is softened into ‘y’. It is perhaps this indefiniteness or peculiarity about its pronunciation and the changes it has undergone in various languages of the South, that made some scholars contend that this is not a peculiarly Dravidian sound, but only common to all the Prakritic languages of India. Though some modern Aryan vernaculars of North India adopted this sound at a later stage in the history of their development, the earlier Prakrits from which these are said to have been derived, never claimed this sound as their own, nor was it mentioned by any of the early Prakrit grammarians or included in their classification of the sounds of the Prakrits. To say that these sounds must have existed in some other Prakritic languages which are now lost, is an argument far beside the point, and more evidence is forthcoming day by day to show that Dravidians or Nagas or those akin to the South Indian peoples formed at least a part of the Non-Aryan people that lived in Northern India before or at the time of the Aryan conquest, and later were either

incorporated into the Aryan society or pushed down towards the south.<sup>1</sup>

It thus seems quite probable that not only some sounds but even some modes of grammatical formation and expression might have gradually crept into the later Aryan vernaculars of North India owing to their usage in the lower classes of society and it is no wonder if this sound 'l' is considered as having crept into the names of certain languages of the North like 'Ōriya,' 'Marvāri,' etc. as an easy substitute for 'ḍ' which these words originally contained. That the name of the former language, viz., 'Ōriya' was originally 'Ōḍra' as far back as the 7th century A.D. can be seen from Hiuen Thsang's reference to the Ōḍras as a barbarous people whose words and language differed from 'Central' India.<sup>2</sup>

It is perhaps because the harsh combination of 'ḍr' in the Sanskrit word could not be pronounced by the ordinary people that 'l' with which they had been familiar had taken its place in that word. Or it may be quite possible that 'ōḍra' was a Sanskritised form of

1. Cf. Under the influence of the Upper Gangetic (Brahmanic) idea of caste, many of the Non-Aryan tribes have become occupation castes in an Aryanised Society. There seems to have been an unbroken connection between Bihar, West Bengal, Kalinga and the Andhra country racially and linguistically. Before the advent of the Santals there were earlier Kol tribes in the West Bengal who with their Dravidian neighbours, have been completely Hinduised. The Maler of Rajmahal Hills, the Oraons of Chota Nagpur, and the Khands of Orissa are some of the ruder Dravidian speakers who still preserve their language in their hill and jungle fastnesses.

—History of the Bengali Language p. 68, by S. K. Chatterji.

2. "Hiuen Thsang described the Ōḍras as a barbarous people, whose words and language differed from 'Central' India. This is a testimony that the sea-board country where Ōriya is now spoken was non-Aryan in speech. But the Ōḍra people rapidly became Aryanised. Krishna Pandita, author of Prakrita Chandrika (12th century) mentions 'Udra' as one of the 27 Apabhramasas: this is perhaps the earliest reference to Ōriya as a distinct Prakritic speech. The spread of Ōriya was at the expense of Dravidian and Kōl, as in Bengal; and a civilised Dravidian speech, Telugu, seems to have receded before Ōriya."

the old indigenous<sup>3</sup> name 'Oḷiya' since 'ḷ' changed into 'ḍ' in later periods. Though 'ḷ' is a sound foreign to the Aryan languages, it is easily convertible into 'ḍ' or 'ṛ' since the place of pronunciation of these sounds is the same—only in the former the contact between the tip of the tongue and the hard palate necessary for the pronunciation of 'ḍ' or 'ṛ' is not made and the breath is allowed to pass through as in the case of 'Uṣhmaś'. This is why 'ḍ' or 'ṛ' came to be substituted for 'ḷ' in many of the later Telugu and Kannada words. But it is easy to turn the tables and argue back by saying that in all those words where 'ḷ' appears in Tamil, Malayalam or Kannada, it might have arisen only as a substitute for 'ḍ' or 'ṛ' or 'r' occurring in Sanskrit or Prakrit words originally. The Kannada grammarian Kesava has already given in his *Sabdamanidarpana* a list of words wherein this letter 'ḷ' came to be substituted in that language in place of 'ṭ', 'ṭh', 't', 'r' and 'ṛ', found in some words of Sanskrit origin.<sup>4</sup> This may be true in some cases, but it also requires further investigation whether at least some words mentioned by Kesava are not due to borrowings the other way, i.e., from the Dravidian languages into the Sanskrit.

Moreover the argument that this sound 'ḷ' which appears in scores of cognate words in languages of South India, is only a development from, or had its origin in, various sounds found in Sanskrit words, cannot be maintained even historically. For though Telugu and Kannada may be said to have no extant literature before the 11th and 9th centuries A.D. respectively, the first extant grammar of the Tamil language can be taken to a far earlier date,—at

3. For the derivation of the word Oriya see S. K. Chatterji's *History of Bengali Language*, page 105, foot note.

As a matter of fact the sound that occurs in 'Oriya' is represented by the letter ṛ, the flapped r or the cerebral r as it is called represented by the Hindi ṛ and not exactly the Dravidian sound represented by ḷ (rzh).

4.	Skt.	Kan.
	Ghaṭike	Galige
	Ghōṭike	Golige
	Maṭhike	Malige
	Kūram	Kūḷ
	Tāḷam	Tāl
	Kukkute	Kōḷi



least to the beginning of the Christian era. This grammar of Tolkaṭṭappiyar not only pre-supposes a large amount of literature, but also a large number of grammatical works in that language to which the author makes references very often. This grammarian who was thoroughly conversant with the Sanskrit language while dealing with the alphabet of Tamil, not only eliminated many other sounds (like the aspirates etc.) of Sanskrit language not found in this, but particularly mentioned this 'ḷ' among the sounds of this language along with what is called the vallinam 'r' which may be said to be the common property of all the languages of South India that are grouped under the term "Dravidian". We have no reason to believe that these sounds were in use in any of the North Indian languages, at that date or even a little later. This sound 'ḷ' was represented in Tamil Vatteluttu script as  $\varphi$  and appears in the inscriptions even as early as the fourth century A.D. (Cf. Tiru-nādhakkunru inscription) in the case of Tamil and from the fifth century onwards to about the 11th century A.D. in Telugu and Kannada inscriptions. About this time it began to drop away from Telugu, and invariably assumed the form of 'ḍ', 'ṛ', 'r' or 'ṛ'; while in Kannada it seems to have persisted for a century or two more.

From the inscriptions published by Dr. Fleet some historical dates regarding the development of ḷ in Kannada may be gathered.

1. From about 600 to 900 A.D.—the ḷ was throughout in use; Cf. eḷ-pattu; aḷi—to destroy; kāḷcu—to wash, etc.

2. From 900 to 1200 A.D.—a transition of 'ḷ' to 'r' or 'ṛ' is observed as we find in aḷti=pleasure, padinēḷu for padinēṛu, peḷ for peṛ=to speak in a Sasana of 929 A.D. Kaḷcu and Kaccu to wash in one of 951 A.D. birddu, ēḷu in one of 1019 A.D., negaḷ, negaṛ=to shine, in one of 1075 A.D.

3. In the mediaeval dialect (from 1200 to 1600 A.D.) and the modern dialect, it is generally represented by 'ṛ', is exceptionally converted into the following letter or it disappeared altogether as baduku—for baḷdumku or barduku.<sup>1</sup>

Most of the inscriptions belonging to the period before the 4th century A.D. discovered in the Telugu country were written in the

1. Kittele's Kannada Grammar, p. 15.

Prakrit language and these letters did not find a place in them. We find most of the inscriptions after that period have been written in Sanskrit, and though the medium of communication was Sanskrit, the names of villages and boundaries mentioned therein were written in the language of the soil—Telugu. It is in some of the words denoting the names of Telugu villages and their boundaries, that these peculiarly Dravidian letters 'ḷ' and 'ṛ' occur, and even when the Nagari script was adopted for writing, these letters find a place in the middle of that script. This clearly indicates that even from that early period neither the Prakrits nor the Sanskrit ever possessed these sounds. From the 7th century onwards, these letters very frequently appear in the Telugu inscriptions of the kings of Chalukya and Chola dynasties not only in the names of villages, but in various other words in the language. If the Prakrit of the Inscriptions of the early Andhra kings is to be considered as the earlier form of the Telugu Language that we find in the Chalukya and Chola inscriptions in Telugu available from the seventh century A.D. onwards, i.e., the beginning of the Chalukyan period, there seems to be no reason why these two peculiarly Dravidian sounds occurring in the village names of the Telugu country from the 4th century onwards, should not have made their appearance in the Andhra, Ikshvaku and Pallava inscriptions of an earlier date.

Even as early as the middle of the fourth century A.D. we find the use of this letter ḷ in the name of a village called Tāṇḷikonḷa, situated on the southern bank of the river Kistnabemna, occurring in the Gorantla Inscription of Attivarman, belonging to the Ananda dynasty. The name of the village was first read by Dr. Fleet as Tānthikontha (Ep. Ind. VIII. p. 328) but later read as 'Tāṇḷikonḷa' by Dr. Hultzsch and now identified with the modern village 'Tāḍikonda', 10 miles to the north of Guntur and to the south of the river Kistna.

In the Bucciredi-pālem plates of Simhavarman II, there is a mention made of a grant of 'Viḷuvaṭṭigrāma' which is identified with Viḍuvalūru of the Kovur Taluq, Nellore District, by Mr. M. Somasekhara Sarma.<sup>1</sup>

1. Journal of the Madras University, Vol. XII, No. 1, 1940.

In the Timmāpuram plates and Chīpurupalli plates\* of Vishnuvardana I also called Vishamasiddhi, we have this 'ḷ' used in the name of a district called "paḷaki vishaya" which later assumed the form 'prakki.'

In the Talamanchi plates of Vikramaditya I we have both 'ḷ' and 'r' occurring in the name "Koḷcunkonra". 'Konra' is only an earlier form of 'Konḍa'—mountain. Cf. Tamil: 'Kunṛu'—hill, mount.

In the Chikkulla plates of Vikramendravarman of the Vishnukundin dynasty, we have both of these peculiar letters occurring in the passage 'ḷendulura vāsakāt rēgōṇṛam nāma grāmam' etc. This 'ḷenduluru' is identified with "Ḍendulūru" or 'dendulūru'—a village to the north of Ellore. (Ep. Ind. Vol. V. p. 134),

We have this 'ḷ' in the name of a person—'Mēḷāmbā Vijayāditya nandano'—This 'Mēḷāmba' appears later as 'Mēḍāmba'.

In Īpūru plates of Vishnuvardhana III (709-750) (I. A. XVIII. p. 58) we have Tāḷi sarmaṇah putrāya' and 'pḷolnāḍu vishaye'. The word 'tāḷi' became 'tāḍi' and 'pḷolnāḍu' became 'prōlanāḍu' in later language.

Panduranga's Addanki inscription has 'Vēngināntin goḷalciya'. Cf. Tamil. Koḷuntu (intr.) to burn in a flame, to be ablaze, to be kindled as fire, to be burnt, etc. 'Koḷalcu' is the causative form of the verb. Or this may be connected with T. Koḷu—to prosper, grow fat. Cf. Te. Krovvu > Kovvu.

In Mangiyuvaraja's Lakshmipuram Inscription we have "irenduṭṭi lacuvaru". 'laccu' is from root 'ali' to destroy aḷacu>laccu, by Metathesis.

In Vishnuvardhana III's Ahadanakara Inscription (709 to 716 A.D.), we have 'Konḍukaḷ' meaning perhaps 'Koḍukulu' sons. Cf. Tamil. Koḷu, Koḷuntu=Tender shoot, anything young, Scion, Cf. also Kuḷantai.

In Malepad inscription of Satyasraya from Cuddappah District (Ep. Ind. XI. p. 345) we have "Choḷa Mahārāja" and "Ēḷuvēla".

In Dimmagudi inscription of Vikramaditya (655-680) (Ep. Rep. 1920. No. 864) we have "laccuvāṇru".

In Ederu Inscription of Vijayaditya II (799-843) (E.I. Vol. V. p. 119) we have "bōlama nāmā".

In Bezwada Inscription of Yudhamalla of the 9th century A.D. we have this letter occurring in three words—'lassi' 'alisina' 'ali-puta'.

In Masulipatam plates of Ammaraja Vishnuvardhana I (918-925) (E.I. V. p. 130) we have "Tālugummi Sīmaiva Sīma".

In the Bezwada Inscription on the Indrakīla mountain (No. 883 of 1917. Ep. Coll.) we have "padiçlagu".

In an inscription of Sakala Lokāśraya Jayasimhavallabha found at Vipparla (S.I.I. Vol. VI) Narasaraopet Taluq, Guntur District, we have 'Kałci viḷa rurla' koti tālu tōntālāyu, besides many other words in which the hard rough 'r' is also used.

In the Raṇasthapundi grant of Vimaladitya (1001 A.D.) i.e., as late as the beginning of the eleventh century A.D. about the time of Nannaya Bhatta the author of the first classical work in Telugu, namely, the Mahabharata, we have this letter 'ṛ' occurring in a number of words—

"pāruvaḷa nāma grāmena"

"kaḷaparti"



"ḷullasimaiva sīma"

"tānkaḷa polam"

In a Chola Inscription from the Cuddappah District, (Ep. Ind. Vol. XI, p. 345) we have Chola maharajadhiraja, where 'ṛ' is used in the word 'chola'.

In the Edevādalapalem Inscription of the 11th century A.D. (1018) another inscription contemporary with Nannayya, we have 'r' used a number of times and in the copy of the inscription published in the Rajarajanarendra pattabhisheka sanchika, the word 'alisina' which occurred in Yuddhamalla's and other inscriptions is found written with 'r' as 'arisina.' It is perhaps a mistake in reading the text 'alisina'.

From this we understand that from the 4th century of the Christian Era onwards to the 11th century, i.e., till the time of Nan-

nayabhatta of the court of Rajarajanarendra, this letter 'ḷ' which is considered as a peculiarly Dravidian one was in regular use in the Telugu language, and so found a place in the Desya words occurring in the Sanskrit and Telugu inscriptions of that period. It is really a wonder that it should have dropped suddenly even in the same century in the literary dialect which has given us the first classical work in the language. The inscriptional evidence shows that it continued for some time even after Nannaya though the gradual change of this 'ḷ' into 'ḍ' or 'ḷ' in the Telugu language, must have already set in in the colloquial usage. The classical Sanskrit scholars of the day who seem to have endeavoured to bring the Sanskrit laden Tatsama style into vogue in the literary dialect of the Telugu language might have considered this as an unnecessary appendage of the Desi element and began to adopt the use of 'ḍ' in its place. The close resemblance of this letter 'ḷ' of the Andhrakarnataka script viz.,  to the letter 'ḍ'  might have further facilitated the process of this change, and we find that in many of the Telugu words 'ḍ' has taken the place of the old Dravidian 'ḷ'. It has also assumed the form of 'ḷ', 'ṛ', 'ḷ', and 'y' in many other words in Telugu. The following list of words indicates the changes which this letter 'ḷ' has undergone in Telugu and other languages of the group.

T=Tamil.  
K=Kannada.

Te=Telugu.  
M=Malayalam.  
Tu=Tulu.

T. M. K.

*Telugu*

T. *Akal*; K. *Agal*=To excavate, dig out, uproot.

*Agalu*=to be broken.  
*Agalucu*, *agalincu*=to break, uproot.

T. *Akal*; K. *Agal*=a moat.  
*Agalu*=a ditch surrounding a fortification.

*Agadta*=a moat.

T. *Alukku*=blot.

*Aluku*=to blot out, to rub out.

T. *Avil*=to be untied, to open, expand.

*Aviyu*=to be broken.

T. K. *Alāku*=ollock, a measure,

*Alāku*= $\frac{1}{8}$  of a padi, a measure.

- T. M. *Alaku*=beauty, excellence. (*aḷagu*).
- Cf. *Alaku*=fine.  
*Alakana*=fineness,  
 • minuteness.  
 also *Anugu*=beauty.
- T. M. *Alal*=to burn, to become angry (N) Fire, rage, anger.
- Aḍaci-paḍu*=to be roused with anger, to be enraged.  
*Alugu*, (N) *Aluka*=anger.
- K. *Alal*=sorrow, grief, affliction, heat (v) to be burnt.
- Aḍalu*=affliction, etc.
- K. *Alalcu*=to grieve, harass.
- Cf. *Adalcu*
- T. *Alarru* } to be in anguish,  
 } to inflame.
- Aḍaru*
- T. *Alaru*=mire.
- Aḍusu*=mire, mud.
- T. M. K. *Ali*=to perish, to be ruined, decay, suffer.
- Ali*, *alivu*=ruin, destruction.
- Ali*, *aliputa*, (in the pre-Nannaya Inscriptions) to spoil, to ruin, destroy,  
 also "ḍassi, ḍayyu"
- K. *Alipu*=to destroy, (N) ruin, destruction.
- Aru*=to decay, to be ruined as in 'pempu-*aru*=decay, growth being cut off.  
*Aru devulu*=disease that eats away—consumption.
- K. *Ali*, *aḍi*=uselessness, ruin, waste.
- Cf. *aḍi-yāsa*=vain hope.
- T. *Alikaṭtu*=obstacle, hindrance.
- Cf. *Arikattu*, *aḍḍagincu*=to hinder.
- T. *Alu*=to cry, weep, cry aloud.
- ēḍu-cu*=to cry, lament.
- K. M. *Alu* ; *Tu*=Arpini.
- Aḍalu*=to cry aloud.  
*Aracu*, *Arcu*=to cry out.
- T. *Alunku*=to be spoiled, injured, disfigured.
- Aluku*=to rub off, to spoil.

- T. *Aluntu* (caus) *aluttu*=  
to press down, to make  
firm.
- K. *Aldu*=to immerse down,
- Cf. *aḍi*=foot.
- T. *Aluntu*=depth of water,  
*āl*=to immerse.  
*aḷuvam*=depth, pit.
- T. K. M. *āl*=to sink, plunge,  
to be immersed=*mulgudal*.
- Tu. *Ala*=depth.
- K. *Ali*=contempt, disgrace.  
*Aligoḷ*=to despise, to put  
down.
- T. M. K. *ālvar*=Saint.
- T. K. *Āli*, *āṇi*=roundness, a  
circle.
- T. M. *Ila*=to lose, forfeit.  
*Ilappu*, *Ilavu*=loss, des-  
truction, ruin.
- T. M. K. Tu. *Ili*=to descend,  
dismount, to be degrad-  
ed.
- T. K. M. *Iranku*=to descend,  
to disembark.
- K. *Ilapu*, *ilipu*=to cause to  
descend, to take down.
- T. M. *iḷu*; K. *iḷ*=to draw, to  
drag, pull.  
K. *eḷe*.  
(N) *Iluppu*=drawing,  
pulling.
- Alandu* > *aladu* > *addu*=to  
press down, to colour  
clothes by immersing in  
coloured water, etc.
- aḍucu*=to press down.  
*aḍugu*=foot.
- Lōntu* > *lōtu*=depth as of  
water.
- Aḍagu* > *anagu*=to be im-  
mersed.
- Lōgu*=to sink in water.
- āḍu*—*tīrthamāḍu*=to bathe  
in water by immersion.
- Cf. *munuguṭa*=to sink in  
water.
- āḍu*=to abuse.  
*ālignonu*=to despise, to speak  
with contempt.
- Ālvāru*
- Cf. *āṇi mutyamu*=round pearl.
- Cf. *iḍi* in '*mukk-iḍi*=noseless,  
'*vāl-iḍi*'=tailless, etc.
- iḷigu* > *ḍigu*=to descend, also  
*digu*.
- eragu*=to get down, to fall  
prostrate.
- Cf. *dimpu*=to cause to come  
down.
- iḍu*, *iḍucu*=to drag along.  
*Lāgu* (?)=to pull, drag,  
(n) *iḍupu*=drawing.

*ilukkam*=Fault, offence.

*ilukku*=to fall from a high position, suffer misery.

K. *ilike*=descent, degraded condition.

T. *ilavan*=toddy drawer.

K. *ul*=ut, *ulu*=to plough

T. M. *Ulu*, *ulakku*=to disturb, stir up, to plough.

T. *uludal*=ploughing.

Tu. *ura*=ploughing, also *ūd*.

T. *ulavan*=agriculturist.  
*ulavu cāl*=furrow.

T. M. K. *Uli*, *ulal*=to oscillate, swing, to whirl, to be loosened and fly away.

K. *Uli*=to leave, abandon, quit, to be left, remain.

T. M. *oli*=to cease, desist, die, perish, etc.

T. *ūl*, *ūlu*=to decay, rot, putrefy.

T. *uluntu*=blackgram.

M. *Uluññu*

K. *uddu*, *urdu*.

K. *Ulugu* > *ulgu*=to be attached to, to be fond of, to be pleased with, to love.

Cf. *iḍuma*=suffering, trouble.

*iḍugaḍa*=suffering.

*iḍiga (vāḍu)*.

(*uludu* >) *dunnu*=to plough.

*ūḍucu*=to sow the seedlings

*ūḍpu* (n).

(*nāgaṭi cālu*)

*Ūgu*=to swing.

Cf. *uḍi (vōvu)*, *uriyu*,

*uriyāḍu*=to oscillate.

*ūḍanibāḍu*, cf. also *vadalu*=  
to loosen, be untied.

*Ūḍu*=to be loosened, fly away,  
leave, abandon.

*Vadulu*=to be loosened.

*Odulu*=to quit, leave,

*Uḍugu*=to stop, desist.

*Ūlu*, *ūlipōvu*=to get spoiled,  
putrefy.

*Uddulu*.

*olayu*=to be attached to\*

“ఒలసి నీపుత్రులెల్ల నొండ్చునులతోడ

నెట్టొడంబడియుండును రట్లుచేయ - వలయు (భార. సభా, 2 ఆ)



- T. *Umil* } To emit as saliva,      *Umiyu*=to spit  
 K. *Ugul* } to spit out.      (> *Ummu*).
- Tu. *Ubi, ubul* }  
 K. *Ummulu* } =Phelgm.      *Ummi*=spittle.
- K. *Umbali, umbalige* =a rent.  
 Tu. *Umboli* free plot      *Umbali* (*grāma*)  
 T. *Umbilikikai* of ground.
- K. *Ūliga*, T. M. *Uliyam*=      *Ūḍigamu*=service.  
 work, business, service.
- T. *Ūliyan*=slave.
- M. T. *Elu*, K. *el*=to stand up,      *Lēcu*=to rise up, to awake.  
 to rise, to awake, to      *Ekku*=to rise up, to ascend.  
 spring up.
- Tu. *lak*.      *Rēgu*=to rise as the dust, etc.
- T. *Elucci*=rising.      *Rēpu, lēpu*=to cause to rise up.  
*Eluppu*=to cause to rise.
- K. *ēru*=to rise.      *Ēpu*=growth.
- K. *elcar, eccar*=to awake, to      *Eccarillu*=to be wakeful.  
 be wakeful, vigilant, cau-      *Eccarika*=caution.  
 tious.
- K. *Eltu* > *ettu* (that pulls or      *Eddu*=an ox.  
 draws)=a bull, an ox.
- T. M. *eluttu*=writing, letter,      *Ēdu*=seven.  
 signature, what is drawn
- T. *Eludu*=to write.
- T. *Ēl*; K. M. *Ēlu*; Tu. *elu*=      *Ēdu*=seven.  
 seven.
- T. *Oḷukkam*=conduct, beha-      *Oḍikamu*=behaviour.  
 viour, acting according  
 to rules
- T. *Oḷuku*, K. *Oḷku*.      *Oluku*=to flow down,  
*Ōḍu*=to leak.
- M. *Oḷuku*=to flow, as a  
 stream, leak, drop.
- T. *Oḷukal, oḷukkam*=height.      *Oḍuku* (*duḍuku*)=rugged.

- T. *Olukku*=to draw out as  
gold thread. *Vaḍuku, oḍuku.*
- K. *Kankul*, T. *Canka*,  
*Kaikkuli*=the arm pit, *Cankili, Canka.*
- Tu. *Kankula.*
- T. *Katalvu*=haste, speed, agi-  
tation K. *Kadaḍu* = commotion,  
tumult, trouble.
- T. M. *Kaviḷ*=to be capsized,  
turned upside down, K. *Kavicu*=to be overthrown,  
stoop, bend down. upset.
- T. M. K. *Kaḷal*=to become  
loose, to be unhinged, to  
slip off. *Kadalu, Kadulu*
- T. *Kaḷarru*=to unfasten,  
loosen. *Kadalvu.*
- K. *Kaḷalcu* < *Kaḷalisu*
- T. K. *Kaḷal*=anklet given as a  
token of honour *Kaḍiyamu.*
- T. K. *Kaḷi* (adj.)=much, great,  
excessive *Kaḍu*=greatly.
- Kaḷi*=rod, cudgel, staff,  
stick handle *Karra, Kaḍḍi,*
- K. *Kaḷi* (*Kaḍi*)=sour gruel. *Kali.*
- M. T. K. *Kaḷi*=to pass as time,  
to go beyond or removed  
far, to pass away *Kaḍacu* (Skt. *gal*?).
- Kaḷippu*=to spend time. *Kaḍapu.*
- T. *Kaḷutai*, K. *Kaḷte*, *Katte*,  
M. *Kaḷuta*, *Gāḍida* (Skt. *gardabha*?)
- Tu. *Katte*=ass, donkey.
- T. *Kaḷuttu*=neck, throat. *Kuttuka, gontu.*
- K. *Kattu*
- T. *Kaḷuku*, M. *Kaḷu*=Eagle *Gradda, gadda.*
- T. *Kaḷumu*=to join, unite,  
come together, crowd *Krammu, Kaliyu* (?)  
*Kadumu, Kadiyu,*

- T. *Kaluvu*, M. *Kaluku*,=to wash, rinse, purify,  
*Kalunīr*.  
*Kāl Kaluvu* = wash the feet  
*Kālu*=melt and mould as metal.
- T. *Kalai*=bamboo.  
M. *Kāla*=pole,  
*Kalaikūttu*=pole dancing.
- K. *Gāla*, *Gaḷugu*=a bamboo pole > *Gaḍa*.
- T. *Kali-p-pul*=a kind of grass.
- T. *Kāl*=to become hard, firm, hardness
- K. *Kaḍu*, *Kaṭṭi*=firmness, strength
- K. *Kāl*=a small pebble, grain.
- T. *Kāl*=iron rod, handle.
- T. K. *Kāl*=blackness, blemish
- K. *Kalgu*=to turn black  
*Kaḷtale* > *Kattale*=darkness
- K. *Kāru*, *Kār*=blackness.
- K. *Kāl* ; T. M. Tu. *Kāḍu*=forest.
- K. *Kimul*=the state of being crushed or made small.
- T. K. *Kīl*, *Kilgu*=to be low.
- K. *Keḷagu*=under, down, bottom.
- T. *Kilakku*=low place, bottom, east.
- Kaḍugu*=to wash  
*Kaḍugunīr*.  
*Kālu Kaḍugu*.
- Karugu*=to melt
- Gaḍa*=pole, bamboo.
- Gaḍapaināṭa*.
- Garika*=a kind of grass
- Gaṭṭi*=firm, strong,
- Gaḍḍa*=hard stone  
*Kāḍa*.
- Kāru*=blackness.
- Kara*=stain.  
*Karuppu* > *Kappu*.
- Cimuḍucu*=to make pulpy like rice, etc.
- Krī*, *Krinda*,  
*Kinda*.

- M. *Kīlu*=beneath, under etc.
- Tu. *Kiḍu*=inferiority, base-ness. *Kiḍu*=evil.
- T. *Kilama*, *Kilavu*=old age. *Giḍasa*, (old).
- T. *Kilamai*=relation, friendship. *Chelimi*=friendship,  
*Keḷuvu*. *Cheluvuḍu*=friend.
- K. *Keḷe*, *Keḷetana*=union, friendship, companionship. *Cheli*=female friend.
- T. *Kilī*=to be torn, rent in shreds. *Cirugu*=to be torn.  
*Kilivu*=rent, tear, to scratch, draw lines. (n) *Cirugu*, *cinugu*.  
*Gīyu*.
- M. *Kilī*.
- T. K. *Kiḷ*, (*kiḷ*)=to rend, tear, spilt. *Gīru*, *Cīru*=to rend,  
*Cilucu*=to split.
- K. *Kiḷ*, *Kīlu*=to pluck out, uproot, to pull off. *Gillu*=to pluck.
- T. *Kilppaṭu*=to submit, yield. *Kiḍpaḍu*=to become low or  
ruined.  
(N) *Cēḍpātu*=ruin.
- K. *Kuḷa*, *guḷa*=a plough share, an iron used in cauterizing. *Korru*.
- T. *Kulivu*=hollowness, depression. *Gurigi*, (colloq).
- T. M. *Kuḷi*=to make hole, to dig; K. (N) a pit, cavity. *Groccu*, *Groyyu*=to dig.  
*Groyyi*, *goyyi*=pit.
- T. *Kuḍankai*=palm of the hand, cubic foot, (square foot). *Kunṭa*, (cubic measure)
- Kulici*=pot, cooking vessel. *Kunḍa*=an earthen pot.
- T. *Kuḷa*,=young, tender.
- Kulaku*=youthfulness, beauty, infant. *Kodama*=youthfulness.

*Kulakan*=youth.

*Koḍuku*=son.

*Kulantai*=young one, infant,  
babe.

*Kōḍe*=young calf.

K. *Koḍa*=tenderness.

*Koḍa Kūsu*=young girl.

K. *Kula*=confusion.

T. *Kulappam*=confusion, dis-  
order.

*Goḍava*.

T. *Kulumu*=to collect in large  
numbers.

*Kūḍu*,=to add up, assemble.  
(N) *Kūḍika*.

*Kuluvu*=assemblage.

*Kūṭamu*=a crowd.

*Kulu*=assembly.

K. *Kole*=to wear out, rot,  
become putrid.

*Kruḷḷu*=to become putrid,  
rotten > '*Kuḷḷu*'.

K. *Kol*, *Kolḷu*=the state of  
being worn out, rotten,  
putrid.

T. *Kulai*, *Kula Kula*=to be-  
come pulpy.

K. *Kulgu*=to contort, shrink.

*Krunḡu* > *Kunḡu*.

T. *Kulal*=a hollow tube, a  
flute.

K. *Kolal*, *Kolavi*=a tube,  
pipe.

*Krōvi* (*pillana grōvi*)=flute.

Tu. *Kolave*;

T. *Kulāy*.

*Goṭṭamu*=tube, pipe.

*Kulāyi*=water pipe.

T. *Kulici*=pot, large pot, hub  
of a wheel.

*Guḍusu*=round, a halo.

Tu. *Guḍusu*.

T. M. K. *Kul*=Thick gruel,  
semi liquid food.

*Kūḍu*=food.

Tu. *Kūḷu*.

T. *Kaikali*=to go beyond.

*Kaikaḍacu* (= *Ceyidāṭu*).

<i>Kai-kaḷuvu</i> =to wash hands.	<i>Cheyi-kaḍugu</i> .
T. <i>Koḷi</i> =to sift in a winnowing pan.	<i>Kōḍu</i>
T. <i>Koḷuntu</i> =to burn in a flame, to be scorched.	<i>Koḍi</i> =tip of a (burning wick of) flame.
T. <i>Koḷu</i> =to prosper, flourish, to grow fat.	
K. <i>Korbu</i> > <i>Korvu</i> > <i>Kobbu</i> =to grow fat.	<i>Krovvu</i> > <i>kovvu</i> =fat.
T. M. K. <i>Kōḷi</i> =cock, fowl.	<i>Kōḍi</i> (Skt. <i>Kukkuta</i> ?).
Tu. <i>Kōri</i>	
K. <i>Gaḷa</i> =quick motion.	<i>gaḍa, gaḍa</i> =swiftly, fluently.
K. <i>Gōḷ</i> =to lament, howl.	<i>Gōḷa; gōḍu</i> =lamentation.
T. <i>Cīḷ</i> =pus	<i>Cīmu</i> =pus (v) <i>Cimuku, Cīku</i>
K. <i>Kī, Kīvu</i> .	=to get decomposed.
T. <i>Cīḷku</i> > <i>Cīku</i> =broom grass, cf. <i>Cīmpul</i> =broom grass.	<i>Cīm</i> —as in <i>Cīmpuru</i> > <i>Cīpuru</i> =broom stick.
T. <i>Cūḷal</i> =to whirl, to revolve.	<i>Suḍiyu</i>
T. M. <i>Cūḷi</i> =to be curved, to form whirlpools.	<i>Suḍi</i> (n).
K. <i>Sūḷi</i> =to whirl, to revolve. <i>Cūḷal kāl</i> > <i>cūḷal kārru</i> =whirlwind.	<i>Suḍigāli</i> =whirlwind.
<i>Cūḷ</i> > ( <i>Curru</i> )=to surround, envelop, to go round. Tu. <i>Tuli, Suli</i> .	<i>Cuṭṭu</i> =to go round.
<i>Ceḷumai</i> =greatness, beauty, excellence.	<i>Ceḷuvamu</i> > <i>ceḷuvu</i> =beauty.
T. <i>Chōḷa</i>	<i>Chōḍa, Chōḷa</i> .
T. <i>Taḷai</i>	<i>Talircu</i> =to sprout, put forth new foliage.
M. <i>Taleka</i> =to sprout, shoot forth; K. <i>Taḷir</i> .	

- K. *Tāl*, *tālu*=The palmyra tree. *Tādi* (*chetu*).
- T. K. *Tāl*=bolt, bar of a door. *Tālamu*.
- M. *Tāluka*=to fall low, to be lowered, sloping, sinking. *Tāru*=to be lowered.
- T. K. *Tālvāram*=low roof, sloping roof. *Tālvāramu*, *Tāvāramu*.
- T. *Tālmai*,  
M. *Tālma*,  
K. *Tālime* } =humility, inferiority in rank. *Tālmī*, *Tālimi*=patience.
- T. K. *Tālvu*=depth.
- K. *Tuppul*=a feather, soft hair of birds or rabbits. *Truppuḍu*  
*tuppuḍu*=wool.
- T. K. *Tegal*, *Tittu*=to rebuke, blame, abuse. *Tegaḍu*, *tittu*.
- K. *Tuli*=to tread, tread upon, trample, crush to pieces with feet. *Trokku* > *tokku*=to tread on
- T. M. *Toḷi*; Tu. *tōr*.
- K. *Tulil*=work, servitude, slavery, T. *Toḷil*. *tottarikamu*.
- K. *Toḷtu* *Tottu*=servant maid.
- T. *Toḷuttai*=a male or female servant.
- K. *Tolal*=to move round, to get perplexed, wander about. *Toḍaru*=to move about.  
*Toṭṭrupaḍu*=to falter, to get perplexed.
- M. T. *Toḷu*=to salute by joining hands, to adore. *Dōyili*=two hands joined.  
*Dōyilincu* (v) also *jōḍincu*.
- K. *Tulil*=a salutation, a bow.

K. <i>Toḷil</i> =heroism, valour.	<i>Toḍi</i> *=valour (?)
T. <i>Toḷu</i> =cattle stall.	Cf. <i>torrupattu</i> =cow pen.
K. <i>Tuḷil</i> , M. <i>Toḷuga</i> =manger, pound.	
K. <i>Tēl</i> > <i>Cēl</i> =Scorpion.	<i>Tēlu</i> .
T. <i>Tēl</i> .	
T. <i>Naḷukku</i> (caus. of) <i>naḷunku</i> =to torture, distress, to pound coarsely as paddy.	<i>Narumu</i> =pounding. <i>nurucu</i>
T. <i>Nāl</i> > <i>nāl</i> =day, time.	<i>Nāḍu</i> =day.
K. <i>Nāl</i> > <i>nāḍu</i> =country.	<i>Nāḍu</i> =country.
T. M. <i>Nīlal</i> , K. <i>Neḷal</i> =shade, shadow.	<i>Nīḍa</i> .
K. <i>niḷku</i> , <i>niḷuku</i> .	<i>Nikku</i> =to stretch, <i>niḷku</i> > <i>nikku</i> .
K. <i>Nīl</i> , <i>nīḍu</i> =length.	
K. <i>Nīl</i> , <i>nigul</i> =to grow long, to extend.	<i>Niguḍu</i> =to grow long, extend.
T. M. <i>Nīl</i> . K. <i>Nīḷpu</i> =length.	<i>Niḍupu</i> =length.
T. <i>nuḷuntu</i> , <i>nuḷutu</i> =to tie as a coil of hair, to insert, tuck in.	<i>Nulumu</i> .
T. <i>nuḷuval</i> =anything slip- pery. <i>nuḷai</i> =fine.	Cf. <i>Nunupu</i> =smoothness.
T. <i>Nekīl</i> =fire, firebrand.	<i>Negaḍi</i>
K. <i>negal</i> =to become mani- fest, well known, to shine, appear.	<i>Negaḍu</i> =to shine, to be re- nowned.
T. <i>Nigal</i> =to shine,	
K. <i>Negalte</i> =fame.	
K. <i>Neḷil</i> > <i>neril</i> =breaking.	<i>Neṭikalu</i> — <i>meṭikalu</i> =breaking of the finger joints.

నడచి శరావళిన్ దనుజనాథుల మేనులు సించి కంఠనుల్

“దొడిదొడిద్రుంచి”-(భాగ. 9 స్కం)-=సంభ్రమము. శ, ర,



T. *Paḷakkam*=practice, custom, > *vaḷākkam*.  
K. *baḷake*.  
*Vāḍuka*=custom, practice.

T. *Paḷa*=that which is old or damaged by time.  
*prā, prāta*=that which is old.

T. K. *Paḷam*=fruit.  
*Panḍu*=fruit.

T. *Paḷaṇ* — col., *paḷamolī*=  
proverb, maxim.

T. *Paḷu*=to ripen, become old.  
*Panḍu*=to ripen.

*Paḷukkappōḍu*=to ripen.  
*Pandavēyu*.

*Paḷamai* = oldness, antiquity.  
*Prāta*=old.

*Paḷuppu*=yellowish pink.

*Pasupu*=yellow colour.

*Paḷuppu*=ripeness.

*Palakamāru*=to get ripe.

T. *Paḷi*=to blame, censure, slander.  
*prayi*=blame, *prayiveṭṭu*,  
*prayyiḍu*.

K. *paḷke*=bed; T. *paḍukkai*.  
*paḍuka* > *pakka*.

T. *Pāl*=to go to ruin, to be laid waste.  
*pāḍagu*.

K. *Pāl* > *bāl*=waste land.  
*pāḍu*.

T. K. M. *Pāl*, *Paḷuvam*.  
*Pāḍu*

T. K. *Pīli*, M. *Pīliyuka*=to squeeze, press out.  
*Piḍucu*=to squeeze.

T. *Pīlukkai*,  
*Piḍuka*=dry dung cake.

K. *pīlke*, M. *Pīlukku*=dung of sheep or goat.

T. K. *Puḷu*, *puḷu*=a worm insect.  
*purugu*=a worm.  
*pruvvu*

K. *Puḷuku*=that is eaten by vermin, T. *puḷuttu*.  
*puccu*=to be worm-eaten.

Tu. *purku*.

T. M. *Puḷudi*, *pūli*=powder, dust,  
*poḍi*.

K. <i>puḍi</i> ; Tu. <i>poḍi</i> .	
T. <i>Puḷungu</i> , M. <i>Puḷuññu</i> =to be boiling, to be steamed.	<i>Pongu</i> .
Tu. <i>Purgu</i> =to be well boiled.	
K. <i>Puḷgi</i> , <i>pongalu</i> , T. <i>Pulagu</i> =rice boiled with some pulse, etc.	<i>Pulagamu</i>
T. <i>puḷukku</i> , M. <i>puḷukku</i> , K. <i>pulga</i> . Tu. <i>porgu</i> .	<i>pokku</i> =boil, ulcer.
K. <i>pūḷ</i> , M. <i>pūḷu</i> =to bury, to be buried.	<i>Pūḍu</i> =to be buried. <i>pūḍcu</i> =to bury.
T. M. <i>pugaḷ</i> , K. <i>pogaḷ</i> =to praise. Tu. <i>pugar</i>	<i>pogaḍu</i> =to praise.
K. <i>Pogaḷte</i> =praise.	<i>pogaḍta</i> .
K. <i>Porkuḷ</i> > <i>pokkuḷ</i> =naval.	<i>pokkili</i>
T. <i>Pōkil</i>	
K. <i>Peḷaku</i> =a wrangle, quar- rel, a fight.	<i>penakuva</i> =fight.
T. <i>piṇakku</i> .	
<i>peṇagu</i> , <i>peṇasu</i> .	<i>penagu</i> =to wrangle, quarrel.
K. <i>pēḷ</i> =to say, to utter, to speak. T. <i>pēcu</i> .	<i>prēlu</i> .
K. <i>poḍaḷ</i> =to come forth, to become conspicuous, famous, come in sight.	<i>poḍalu</i>
K. <i>poḷaku</i> =form, shape.	<i>poḍa</i>
K. <i>poḷal</i> , <i>poḷalu</i> =a dwelling place, a town.	<i>plōlu</i> (In Inscriptions).
T. <i>poḷil</i> =a country.	<i>prōlu</i> =a village, town, (This comes at the end of many place-names).
T. M. <i>poḷudu</i> , K. <i>poḷtu</i> =The Time, Sun.	<i>proddu</i> > <i>poddu</i> .
T. K. <i>Pōḷ</i> , <i>Pōḷu</i> =to split, di- vide into part.	<i>Porapu</i> =division.

- K. *baḷal*=to become weary, *baḍalu*.  
to be fatigued.
- K. *baḷalike* (N).
- T. *vaḷalikkai*=weariness. *baḍalika*
- K. *baḷi*=going, passing; a *baḍi. pari*=way, method.  
way; Road. *baḍin* (adv.).
- T. M. *vaḷi*. *vaḍi*=a way, Yati in prosody.
- T. *vaḷi*=to shed, let flow. *vaḍiyu, vaḍiyagaṭṭu*.
- K. *bāl*=to live, to be alive, *braduku*=to live, *batuku*.  
to subsist, *baḍunku*.
- T. M. *vāl*=to live, exist, *vaḷalu*=flourish.  
flourish.
- K. *bīḷ, bīḷu*=a waste. *bīḍu*=waste land.
- T. *viḷal*.
- K. *bēḷ, bēḍu*=to wish, *vēḍu*.  
request, solicit, beg.
- T. *vēṇḍu* Tu. *bēḍu*.
- K. *bōḷisu*=to shave. *bōḍi*  
*bōḷa*=a man with bald  
shaven head, *bōḷi*=a widow.
- K. *bōḷatara*. *bōḍasaramu* = *sphaeranthus*  
*hirtus*
- K. *mālke*=manner, mode, *māḍki*=manner.  
doing, performance.
- māl*=to do > *māḍu*.
- K. *maguḷ*=to turn round or *maguḍu* = to return, turn  
back. back.
- T. K. *muḷugu, muḷgu,*  
*muḷungu*; Tu. *murku*=  
to sink under water,  
to be plunged, to be  
ruined. *Muṇugu, muḍugu,*  
*Mulugu*.
- K. *Malgu*=to disappear, to *maḍagu*=to perish, to become  
perish. T. *mālku*. useless.
- K. *Mallaḷi*=turning round, *mallaḍi*.  
wandering about.

- T. *Maḷungu*, *mayangu*,=to loose lustre, grow dim, confused, bewildered. *masaṭu*, *masaka*=dimness.
- K. *manku*=dim.
- T. *Maḷa*, *Maḷamai*=youth, infancy. *Maḍati*=young woman.  
*Maḷavan*=young man. also 'paḍati'.
- T. *maḷunku*.  
*Maḷukku*=to blunt, dull the edge. *Maḍagu*, *Maṇugu*.  
(Caus). *Maḍacu*.
- T. *Miḷi*=high. *miḍi* (*gruḍḍu*).
- T. *Miḷunku*, *viḷunku* = to swallow. *mringu* > *mingu*  
*Muḍusu*
- T. *Muḷi*, *moḷi*=joint as of a body. *Muḍumu*
- K. Tu. *mudi*=a knot. *Muḍi*
- M. *Muḷi*  
*Muḷankāl*. Tu. *murangāl* *Mōkālū*=knee joint.
- T. *Mukil*, *mūl*=to close as the bud, to swarm round. *muguḍucu*=to close.  
*mūgu*=swarm.
- K. *meḷasu*, T. *Miḷagu*=pepper. *Miriyamu*.
- K. *Mōla*=a cubit; T. *muḷam*. *Mūra*=a cubit.
- T. *Muḷukka*=to look askance. *Muraḱaṭincu*.
- K. *Mōlagu*=to sound as certain musical instruments, to roar, thunder. *Mrōgu*=to sound as musical instruments.
- T. *Muḷangu*. *Morugu*=barking of a dog.
- M. *Muḷañṇu*.
- T. *Moḷi*=word. *Mrōta*=sound, noise.  
*Mōḍi*=word.
- K. *moḷgu*=to bow, bend, bow to. *Mrokku*, *mokku*,  
*Mōḍupu*, *mōḍtsu*, *mroggu*.

- T. *mulai*=stump. *Mrōḍu* > *mōḍu*.
- T. *vaḷaṅgu*, *vālvu*=to make use of. *Vāḍuka*=usage, custom.
- K. *bali*; *Vāḍike*=usage. *Vāḍu*=to make use of.
- T. *Viḷudu*, *Vīl*.
- K. *biḷal*, *biḷal*=a banyan shoot. *Ūḍa*=shoot of the banyan tree.
- T. M. *Viḷu*, *vīlu* *Vīḍu*, *viḍucu*, *vrīlu*
- K. *biḷ*, *biḷu*=to fall, slip from the hand, to die. *biddu*=to die.
- Tu. *būru*.
- K. *Sūli*, *tūli*=to revolve, turn, to whirl. *Suḍiyu*  
*Suḍi*.
- Tu. *Tuli*.
- T. *Cūli*, *Curi*, *Cūlal*. *Cuṭṭa*.
- K. *Sūlu*, *Sūl*=a time, a turn. (oka)-*Cuṭṭu*, *tūri*=once.

## ANḌAYYA

By

M. MARIAPPA BHAT, M.A., L.T.,

*Head of the Kannada Department.*

Nayasēna (1112), Harihara (1216), Rāghavānka (1240) and Āṇḍayya are some of the great reformers in the field of Kannada Literature. They found the pendulum swinging to the other extreme of 'over-Sanskritization', whereby Kannada became inaccessible to the common literate. So they strained their every nerve to rectify matters and preserve the individuality of the Kannada Language. Nayasēna's naive simplicity of style, Harihara's novel vacanas and Ragales, Rāghavānka's new Śatpadi metres and Āṇḍayya's purity of language bear eloquent testimony to their unique achievements.

In this article Āṇḍayya's famous work 'Kabbigara Kāva' has been critically examined. In it Āṇḍayya has performed a marvelous feat by creating a masterpiece of literature out of the dry Puranic episode of "Śiva-Kāma Battle". Characterisation, situations, conversations and descriptions have been accomplished with a consummate skill. The excellence of the work lies in the fact that the poet has pressed into service only Dēśya and some Tadbhava words and with perfect ease has sung, in an inimitable style, so as to be understood and appreciated by one and all. Āṇḍayya has given us a host of pure Kannada compounds whose meanings are self-evident.

On the whole, 'Kabbigara Kāva' is simple but dignified poetry that shines like a beacon for all time inspiring new life and outlook in those who seek to progress.



## ಆಂಡಯ್ಯ .



ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯ ಚೂತವನವು ಅತಿ ಮನೋಹರವಾಗಿ ಬೆಳೆಯಿತು. ವೃಕ್ಷಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ದಾಂಗುಡಿವಿಟ್ಟು ಹೂ, ಮಿಡಿ, ಕಾಯಿ, ಹಣ್ಣುಗಳಿಂದ ಇಡಿಕಿರಿದು ಮೆರೆಯತೊಡಗಿದುವು. ಇಂತಹ ಮನೋಹರೋದ್ಯಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಕನ್ನಡ ಕವಿ ಕೋಗಿಲೆಗಳು ಹಾರಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಹಾಡತೊಡಗಿದುವು. ಆಗ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರು ನಾಡಿಗೆ ನಾಡೇ ಆನಂದದಿಂದ ಹಿಗ್ಗಿ, ಪೊಂಪುಳಿಹೋಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಆದರೇನು? ಬರಬರುತ್ತಾ ಆ ಕೋಗಿಲೆಗಳ ಇನ್ನಿಡಾದ ಕಲನಿನದವನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ ತಲ್ಲೀನತೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುವುದು ಎಲ್ಲ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರಿಗೂ ಅಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಯಿತು. ತಮ್ಮ ನಾಡಿನ ಹಾಡುವ ಹಕ್ಕಿಗಳ ಸರವನ್ನು ಕೇಳುವ ಕುತೂಹಲವು ನಾಡಿಗರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚುತ್ತಾ ಹೋದಂತೆಯೇ, ದುರದೃಷ್ಟದಿಂದ ಆ ಹಾಡುಗಳ ನೋಡಿಯು ಏರುತ್ತಾ ಹೋಯಿತು. ಸಾರಾಂಶ— ಅತಿ ವಿಪುಲವಾದ ಕನ್ನಡ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಿಯ ಕಳೆಯು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿತು. ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಕವಿವೃಷಭರನ್ನೇಕರು ಸ್ತುತ್ಯವಾದ ಅನೇಕ ಕೃತಿಗಳನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಿ, ಕನ್ನಡವು ಲೋಕೋತ್ತರವಾದ ಮಹಾ ಭಾಷೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಗಣ್ಯವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಆದರೆ, ಅವರ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಗ್ರಂಥಗಳು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಪದ ಭೂಯಿಷ್ಠಗಳೂ, ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯಾನುಕರಣವುಳ್ಳವೂ ಆಗಿ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರ ಪಾಲಿಗೆ ಕಬ್ಬಿಣದ ಕಡಲೆಗಳಾಗಿಯೇ ನಿಂತುವು. ಬೇಕು ಬೇಡವೆಂಬ ವಿಚಾರವೇ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ, ಹಲವು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇವಲ ಶಬ್ದಾಡಂಬರಕ್ಕೂ, ತಂತಮ್ಮ ವೈದುಷ್ಯಪ್ರದರ್ಶನಕ್ಕೂ ಬಳಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲದ, ಬಳಸಲು ಸುಲಭವಲ್ಲದ ಕ್ಲಿಷ್ಟಪದಗಳನ್ನು ತಂದು ತುಂಬಿದರು. ಇದರಿಂದ ಬತ್ತದ ಪೈರನ್ನು ಬೆಳೆಸುವ ಹೊಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಉದ್ದಿನ ಗಿಡಗಳ ಕಳೆಯಿದ್ದಂತೆಯೇ ಆಯಿತ್ತಲ್ಲದೆ ಹುಲುಸಾದ ಬತ್ತದ ಬೆಳೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲವಾಯಿತು. ಬತ್ತದ ಬೆಳೆಯು ಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವಂತೆ ಉದ್ದಿನ ಬೆಳೆಯೂ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅವುಗಳು ಬೇರೆಬೇರೆ ಹೊಲಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಳೆಯಲಿ. ಒಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಎರಡನ್ನೂ ಒಂದೇ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಳೆಯಗೊಳಿಸಿದರೆ ಯಾವುದೊಂದೂ ಹುಲುಸಾಗಿ ಬೆಳೆಯಲೊಲ್ಲದು.

ಆರಯ್ದು ನೋಡಿದರೆ, ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಕನ್ನಡಗಳ ಮಿಶ್ರಣದಿಂದ ಲಾಭವೇನೋ ಉಂಟು. ಆದರೆ ಲಾಭದೊಡನೆ ಹಾನಿಯೂ ಉಂಟಾಗಿದೆ. ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಶಬ್ದಗಳ ಹಾವಳಿಯಿಂದ ಕನ್ನಡದ ದೇಶ್ಯಶಬ್ದಗಳು ಹಿಂದೆ ಬೆಳೆದು ಬಂದಂತೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಬೆಳೆಯಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಷ್ಟು ಮಾತ್ರವಲ್ಲ. ಗುಣನೆಯ ಶತಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಿಂದೆಯಿದ್ದ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಅಚ್ಚಕನ್ನಡ ಶಬ್ದಗಳೂ ಕಣ್ಮರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದುವು. ಅದಿಹಂಪ, ಪೊನ್ನ, ರನ್ನ, ಅಭಿನವಸಂಪ



ಮುಂತಾದ ಪ್ರಾಚೀನರಾದ ಉದ್ಭಾವಕವಿಗಳ ಕೃತಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಣಬರುವ ಅನೇಕ ದೇಶ್ಯ ಪದಗಳು ಈಚಿನ ಮಹಾಕವಿಗಳ ಕಾವ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ರೂಢಿಗೆ ಬರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗೆ ಪಾರಂಪರ್ಯ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಕ್ಕೆ ವಿಚ್ಛಿತ್ತಿಯು ಬಂದುದರಿಂದ ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವಕ್ಕೆ ಇಂದು ಪರಿಚ್ಛಿನ್ನವಾದ ಅರ್ಥವೇ ಆಗುವಂತಿಲ್ಲ. ಬೇರೆಬೇರೆ ಪ್ರಾಚೀನ ಗ್ರಂಥಗಳ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳನ್ನು ಹುಡುಕಿ ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಿ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹೋಲಿಸಿಯೇ ಒಂದು ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಣಯಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯು ಒದಗಿದೆ. ಅತಿ ಇಂಪಾಗಿಯೂ, ಕಿವಿಗೆ ಬಿದ್ದೊಡನೆಯೇ ಅರ್ಥವು ಮೂಡಿ ತೋರಿಬರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಇರುವ ತಿಂಗಳ್, ಬಾನ್, ಮುಂತಾದ ಶಬ್ದಗಳ ಬದಲಿಗೆ, ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದಲೋ, ಚಂದ್ರ, ಆಕಾಶ ಮುಂತಾದ ಶಬ್ದಗಳನ್ನು ಪರ್ಯಾಯಿಸುವುದೇ ನಮಗೆ ಪ್ರಿಯವಾಗಿ ತೋರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಸ್ವಾಭಿಮಾನ, ಸ್ವಭಾಷಾಭಿಮಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಬದಿಗೊತ್ತಿದರೆ, ಕೆಲವು ಕಾಲದನಂತರ ಅಂಥ ದೇಶ್ಯಪದಗಳು ಮೂಲೆಪಾಲಾಗಲೂಬಹುದು. ಹಳ್ಳಿಗರ ಮಾತಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ, “ಗ್ರಾಮ್ಯ”ವೆಂದು ಬೈಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ, ಆದರೆ ಅರ್ಥವತ್ತಾದ, ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಮುದ್ದಾದ ಆರುಗು, ಸೊಡ್ಡು, ದಣಿಯ ಮುಂತಾದ ದೇಶ್ಯ ಶಬ್ದಗಳು ಇನ್ನೂ ಅಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಸ್ಥೆಯಲ್ಲೇ ಇವೆ.

ಹೀಗಾಗಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನಿರಬಹುದು? ಹಿಂದಣ ವಿದ್ವಾನ್ಮಣಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಕನ್ನಡ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಭಾಷೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಶೇಷ ಪಾಂಡಿತ್ಯವಿದ್ದು, ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದ ವಿಶ್ವಸಾಹಿತ್ಯದ ಸೊಬಗಿಗೆ ಅವರು ಮನಸೋತುಹೋದವರಾಗಿ, ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಕ್ಕೆ ಅಂದಿನ ವಾತಾವರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ ವಿಶೇಷ ಪ್ರಾಶಸ್ತ್ಯವಿದ್ದುದರಿಂದ, ಉಭಯಭಾಷಾವಿಶಾರದರಾದ ಕನ್ನಡ ಕವಿವರ್ಯರಲ್ಲಿರೂ, ಕನ್ನಡಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದ ಸೌಂದರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ತಂದು ತುಂಬಿಬಿಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಬದ್ಧಕಂಕಣರಾಗಿದ್ದಂತೆ ತೋರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಧೈಯಸಾಧನೆಯ ಪರಿಣಾಮವಾದರೂ ಕನ್ನಡದ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯಕ್ಕೇ ಮೂಲೇಕುರಾರವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಣಮಿಸಿತು. ಕನ್ನಡವು ತನ್ನ ಕಾಲಿಂದಲೇ ತಾನು ನಿಲ್ಲಲಾರದೆ ಹೋಯಿತು. ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಾನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಪಡೆಯಚ್ಚುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಕಹೊಯ್ದಂತೆ ಒಂದೇ ರೀತಿಯ ಚಂಪೂಗ್ರಂಥಗಳು ಹೊರಡಲಾರಂಭಿಸಿದುವು. ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಲಕ್ಷಣಗ್ರಂಥಗಳ ಪಡೆನಿಲಲುಗಳೂ ತಯಾರಾದುವು. ಎಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡಿದರೂ (೧೨ನೆಯ ಶತಮಾನದವರೆಗೆ) ಚಂಪೂ - ಚಂಪೂ - ಚಂಪೂ. ಅದೇ ಅನೂಚಾನವಾದ ಅಷ್ಟಾದಶ ವರ್ಣನೆಗಳು, ಅದೇ ಕವಿಸಮಯಗಳ ಗುಚ್ಛ, ಅದೇ ಅಲಂಕಾರಗಳ ತಂಡ, ಅದೇ ಕ್ಲಿಷ್ಟಪದಗಳ ಸಂಘರ್ಷಣೆ. ಇಷ್ಟಾಗಿ ದ್ದರೂ ಪ್ರತಿಭಾಶಾಲಿಗಳಾದ ಆ ಕವಿಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ವೈಶಿಷ್ಟ್ಯದ ಅಚ್ಚೆನ್ನೊತ್ತಿ ಕೃತಿರತ್ನಗಳನ್ನೇನೋ ದಯಪಾಲಿಸಿ ಕನ್ನಡನಾಡನ್ನೇ ಚಿರಮುಣಿಯನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವರು. ಆದರೆ ಆ ಕವಿಪುಂಗವರು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಭಾಷಾಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯವನ್ನೂ ಬಂಧಲಾಲಿತ್ಯವನ್ನೂ ವಹಿಸಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅವರ ಗ್ರಂಥಗಳು ಮತ್ತಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಜನಪ್ರಿಯತೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದು ನೆಂಬುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪವೂ ಸಂದೇಹವಿಲ್ಲ.

ಆ ಕಾಲದ ಭಾಷೆಯ ಇಂಥ ದುರವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಸಹಿಸಲಾರದೈ ಕೆಲವುಮಂದಿ ಭಾಷಾ ಪ್ರೇಮಿಗಳು ಅತಿ ಧೈರ್ಯದಿಂದ ಮುನ್ನಡೆದು ಕನ್ನಡ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿೊಂದು ಕ್ರಾಂತಿಯ ನ್ನೆಬ್ಬಿಸಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಅದು ಶಾಂತತರವಾದ ಕ್ರಾಂತಿಯಾಗಿತ್ತಲ್ಲದೆ ಯಾವ ಬಗೆಯಲ್ಲೂ ದುಷ್ಪರಿಣಾಮವನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡುವ ಕ್ರಾಂತಿಯಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದ ನಿರಂಕುಶ ಪ್ರಭುತ್ವವನ್ನು ನಿವಾರಿಸಿ, ಕನ್ನಡದ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವವನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೇ ಅದರ ಗುರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದ ಸಂಬಂಧವೇ ಸಲ್ಲದೆಂದಾಡುವ ಸಂಕುಚಿತ ಬುದ್ಧಿಗಳ ಪುರೋಗಾಮಿಗಳಲ್ಲ. ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತವು ಸ್ವೇಚ್ಛೆಯಿಂದ ಕನ್ನಡ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೈ ಬೀಸುವುದನ್ನು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿ, ಕನ್ನಡವು ಬಯಸಿದ ಸಹಾಯವನ್ನೊದಗಿಸಿದರೆ ಸಾಕೆಂಬುದು ಅವರ ಆಕಾಂಕ್ಷೆ. ಅಂದು (೧೨ನೆಯ ಶತಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿ) ಕನ್ನಡನಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಳ್ಳೆವಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ವೀರಶೈವಮತವೂ ಇಂತಹ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯಕ್ರಾಂತಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಬಲವಾದ ಬೆಂಬಲವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಸಿರಿಗ ನ್ನೆಡವು ಗೆಲ್ಲುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಹಕಾರಿಯಾಯಿತೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಸಾಧ್ಯ. ಈ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯಸಂಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾತಿಭೇದವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಜೈನರೂ ವೀರಶೈವರೂ ಕಲಿತರು. ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ನಯಸೇನ (1112), ಹರಿಹರ (1165), ರಾಘವಾಂಕ (1165), ಅಂಡಯ್ಯ (1235) ಇವರೇ ಅಗ್ರಗಣ್ಯರು.

ನಯಸೇನನು ತನ್ನದೇ ಆದ ಒಂದು ಸುಲಭವಾದ ಮತ್ತು ಜನಸಾಮಾನ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ರುಚಿಕರವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕವಿತೆಯು ಹೇಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಬೊಟ್ಟಿಟ್ಟು ತೋರಿಸಿ, ತನ್ನ “ಧರ್ಮಾಮೃತ”ವನ್ನು ಕನ್ನಡಿಗರಿಗೆ ಮನದಣಿಯೆ ಪಾನಮಾಡಿಸಿ, ಕನ್ನಡದ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯಧ್ವಜವನ್ನೆತ್ತಿ ಹಿಡಿದನು. ಹರಿಹರನು ಪ್ರಾಚೀನ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯದಂತೆ ಚಂಪೂ ಗ್ರಂಥವನ್ನು ಬರೆದವನಾದರೂ ತನ್ನ ಅಚ್ಚುಕಟ್ಟಾದ ವಚನ ಮತ್ತು ರಗಳೆಗಳಮೂಲಕ ಹೊಸಬಗೆಯ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯವನ್ನು ಸಮಾಜಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಟ್ಟಿಸಿದನು. ರಾಘವಾಂಕನು ಮಾತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರವಿದ್ದ ಅನೇಕ ಅಂದಿನ ಹೊಸಗನ್ನಡರೂಪಗಳನ್ನು ಆಯ್ದುಕೊಂಡು ಷಟ್ಪದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾವ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಬರೆದು ಕನ್ನಡ ಭಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಹೊಸ ಯುಗವನ್ನು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸಿ, ಕನ್ನಡಕ್ಕೆ ಅತುಲವಾದ ಸೇವೆಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದನು.

ಈ ಬಗೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾಚೀನ ಮಹಾಕವಿಗಳು ಹಲವರು ಹಲವುಬಗೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡದ ಸ್ಥಾನಮಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾಪಿಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯತ್ನಿಸಿದುದು, ಸಮಕಾಲೀನರನ್ನೇಕರು ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯ ಪ್ರಪಂಚದಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದು

“ ಸೊಗಯಿಪ ಸಕ್ಕದಂ ಬೆರಸಿದಲ್ಲದೆ ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಬ್ಬಮಂ |  
 ಬಗೆಗೊಳೆ ಪೇಟಲಾಹರಿನಿತುಂ ಸಲೆ ಮುನ್ನಿನ ಪೆಂಪನಾಳ್ ಕ ||  
 ಬ್ಬಿಗರದು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದಮೊಲಂದವನಾಳ್ಗೆರೆ ಪೇಟ್ಟು ಬಲ್ಪು ನೆ |  
 ಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ದೊರೆಕೊಂಡುದಿಂತಿನನೊಳ್ಲ್ಲದೆ ಕೇಳ್ಗೊರೆಕೊಳ್ಳದಾರೊಳಂ ||

ಎಂದು ಬೆಸಗೊಂಡುದು, ಪೋಷಕನನ್ನು ಮೆಚ್ಚಿಸುವ ಪ್ರಸಂಗವಿಲ್ಲದುದು-- ಈ ಮೂರು ಪ್ರಬಲ ಕಾರಣಗಳು ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನನ್ನು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ತಿರುಗಿಸಿದುವು. ಅವನು ತನ್ನ “ಸೊಬಗಿನ ಸುಗ್ಗಿ”ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡ ಬಾವುಟವನ್ನು ಮೇಲಕ್ಕೆತ್ತಿ ಹಿಡಿದು ಕಬ್ಬಿಗರ ಪರ್ಮೆಯನ್ನು ಮತ್ತಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಿರುವನು.

ಆತನ ಕೃತಿಗೆ “ಕಾವನಗಲ್ಲ”, “ಮದನವಿಜಯ” “ಕಬ್ಬಿಗರಕಾವ” ಈ ಹೆಸರುಗಳೂ ಇವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ವೈದಿಕ ಪುರಾಣೋಕ್ತ ಶಿವಕಾಮರ ಯುದ್ಧವನ್ನು ವರ್ಣಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನು ಕಾವ್ಯದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದಲೋ, ಐತಿಹಾಸಿಕ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದಲೋ ಯಾವ ಮೂಲದಲ್ಲೂ ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಮೊರಕದ ಒಂದು ಹೊಸ ಕಥೆಯನ್ನು ಸ್ವಪ್ರತಿಭಾಚಾತುರ್ಯದಿಂದ ಹೆಣೆದಿದ್ದಾನೆ. ಕಾಮವಿಜಯದ ಕಥೆಯನ್ನು ಎಂದರೆ ತನ್ನ ಪೂರ್ವದ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಶಾಪದಿಂದ ಮರೆತಿದ್ದ ಕಾಮನಿಗೆ ಅಚ್ಚರಸಿಯೊರ್ವಳು ಹೇಳುವುದು, ಅನಂತರ ಕಾವ್ಯನಿಗೆ ಶಾಪವಿಮೋಚನೆಯಾಗುವುದು. ಜೈನಪುರಾಣಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಜನ್ಮಾಂತರಗಳ ಕಥೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವ ರೂಢಿಯೋ ಅಥವಾ ಕಾಮಂಬರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಗಿಳಿಯು (ವೈಶಂಪಾಯನು) ಜನ್ಮಾಂತರದ ಕಥೆಯನ್ನು ತನ್ನ ಗೆಳೆಯನ (ಶೂದ್ರಕನ) ಸಂಗಡ ಹೇಳುವಂತೆ ರಚಿಸಿರುವ ಬಾಣನ ಕಾವ್ಯಶ್ರವಣಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಿಯೋ ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನನ್ನು ಈ ದಾರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಯದೆಯೇ ತಂದಿರಬಹುದಲ್ಲವೆ? ಆತನು ಹೆಣೆದಿರುವ ಕಥೆಯು ಸಂಕ್ಷೇಪವಾಗಿ ಹೀಗಿದೆ:—

ಚಿಲ್ವಾದ ಕನ್ನಡನಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂವಿನ ಪೊಟಲೊಂದುಂಟು. ಅದನ್ನು ನನೆಯಂಬನೆಂಬರಸನು ಆಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದನು. ಬಸಂತಕಾಲದ ಒಂದಾನೊಂದು ರಾತ್ರಿ ನನೆಯಂಬನು ಕನಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಲೋಕೈಕಸುಂದರಿಯಾದ ರಮಣಿಯೊರ್ವಳನ್ನು ಕಂಡು, ಮಾರನೆಯದಿನ ಬಳಿಯವನಾದ ನಗೆಗಾರನೊಡನೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಲು, ಆತನು ಅರಸನಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಸ್ತ್ರೀರತ್ನವು ಬೇಗನೆ ಲಭಿಸುವುದೆಂಬ ಶುಭಫಲವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದನು. ಬಳಿಕ ಮನೋಹರವಾದ ಬನವನ್ನು ನೋಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನನೆಯಂಬನು ನನೆಯುತ್ತಿರಲು, ತೋಟಗನೊಬ್ಬನು ಬಂದು ಅರಸನಿಗೆ ಫಲಪುಷ್ಪಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾಣಿಕೆಗೊಟ್ಟು, ಬಿನದಕ್ಕೆ ಪಕ್ಕಾದ ಬನವನ್ನು ನೋಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಬಿನ್ನಹಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವನು. ಅರಸನು ವನಪಾಲಕನ ಬಿನ್ನಹದಂತೆ ಸಪರಿವಾರನಾಗಿ ಉದ್ಯಾನವನವನ್ನು ಬಂದು ಸೇರಿರುವನು. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಮರದಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಂತಿದ್ದ ಲೋಕೈಕಸುಂದರಿಯಾದ ಅಚ್ಚರಸಿಯೊರ್ವಳು ಅವನೊಡನೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದಳು.

“ಕಂಪಿನ ಪೊಟಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕರ್ವವಿಲ್ಲನೆಂಬರಸನಿದ್ದನು. ಆತನ ಹೆಂಡತಿ ಚಿಲ್ವಿನ ಪುತ್ತುಳಿ ಯಿಚ್ಛೆಗಾರ್ತಿ. ಒಂದುದಿನ ಆತನು ಓಲಗಗೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾಗ, ಜೊನ್ನವಕ್ಕಿಯು ಬಂದು ಸಿವನೆಂಬ ದುಟ್ಟಗೊರವನು ಕರ್ವವಿಲ್ಲನ ಪರಿವಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಚಂದ್ರನನ್ನು ಸೆರೆಹಿಡಿದನೆಂದು ದೂರಿದಳು, ಕರ್ವವಿಲ್ಲನು ಕಿಡಿಕಿಡಿಯಾಗಿ ಚಂದ್ರನನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತೆಂಗಾಳಿಯೆಂಬ ದೂತನನ್ನು ಸಂದೇಶದೊಡನೆ ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸಿದನು. ದೂತ

ನಿಗೂ ಶಿವನಿಗೂ ಕೆಲವು ಸರುತವದ ಮಾತುಗಳು ನಡೆದುವು. ಅದರೂ ಶಿವನು ಚಂದ್ರನನ್ನು ಬಿಡಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಉತ್ತರವಿತ್ತನು. ಮುಂದಣ ಕಥಾಪ್ರಸಂಗವು ಕರ್ತೃವಿಲ್ಲನ ಯುದ್ಧಸನ್ನಾಹ - ಸೇನೆಯ ಪಯಣ - ದಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿಮಾಯೋಗದ ಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಸವಣದರ್ಶನ - ಅವನನ್ನು ವಂದಿಸಿ ಪಯಣದಮೇಲೆ ಪಯಣವನ್ನು ಬಳಸಿ ಸೇನೆಯು ಮಂಜುವೆಟ್ಟವನ್ನು ಸೇರುವುದು. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇಕ್ಕಡೆಯವರೂ ಯುದ್ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಅಣಿಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರು. 'ತಡಿವಿಾಣು ಬಂದು ತೆಂಕಣ ಬಡಗಣ ಕಡಲೊಂದನೊಂದು ತಾಗುವ ತೆಪದಿಂ' ಎರಡುಕಡೆಯ ದಂಡುಗಳೂ ತಾಗಿದುವು. ಅರಲಂಬನ ಪೂಗಣೆಗಳ ತಾಪವನ್ನು ತಾಳಲಾರದೆ ಈಶನ 'ಪಾಡಿಯೆಲ್ಲಂ ಪಿಟ್ಟಂ ಪಿಟ್ಟಾಗಿ' ಹೋಯಿತು. ಕೊನೆಗೆ ಈಶನೊಬ್ಬನೇ ಉಳಿದನು. ಬಿದಿಯಂ ಪೊಡೆಯಲರನಂ ಸೋಲಿಸಿದ ಕಾಮನು ತನ್ನ ಐದು ಸರಲುಗಳಿಂದ ಶಿವನನ್ನು ಅರೆವೆಣ್ಣಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದನು. ಶಿವನು ಕೊಪಿಸಿದನಾಗಿ 'ಕಾಮನು ತನ್ನೋಪಳನ್ನು ಕೂಡದೆ ಪೆರರಣಾಯದಂತೆಲ್ಲಿಯಾದೊಡಂ ತಾನು ಕಾಮನೆಂಬುದಂ ಮುಱಿದಿರಲಿ' ಎಂದು ಶಾಪವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟನು. ಇದನ್ನು ಬಸಂತನಿಂದ ಇಚ್ಛೆಗಾರ್ತಿ ತಿಳಿದು ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಲಾಪಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಕಾಮನ ಬರವನ್ನು ಹಾರೈಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಳು. ಅತ್ತ ಕಾಮನೇ ಶಿವನ ಶಾಪದಿಂದ ಬೇರೊಂದು ಅಕಾರವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ನನೆಯಂಬನೆಂಬ ಹೆಸರಿನಿಂದ ಪೂವಿನ ಪೊಲಿಲಿನರಸನಾಗಿದ್ದನು. "ಅವನು ಅಂದು ಅಚ್ಚರಿಸಿಯ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದುದರಿಂದ ಶಾಪವಿಮುಕ್ತನಾದನು. ಈ ಕಥೆಯನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಗಿಳಿಯೊಂದು ಮಿಂಚಿನ ವೇಗದಿಂದ ಬಸಂತನೆಡೆಗೆ ಹಾರಿಬಂದು ಕಾಮನ ಆಗಮನದ ಶುಭವಾರ್ತೆಯನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಲು, ಬಸಂತನನ್ನು ಇಚ್ಛೆಗಾರ್ತಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿದನು. ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಅತ್ಯಾನಂದದಿಂದ ಸಕಲ ವೈಭವಗಳೊಡನೆ ಕಾಮನನ್ನು ಇದಿಗೊಂಡುಬಂದರು. ಇಚ್ಛೆಗಾರ್ತಿಗೂ ಕಾಮದೇವನಿಗೂ ಪಟ್ಟಾಭಿಷೇಕ ಮಹೋತ್ಸವವು ಬಹು ವಿಜೃಂಭಣೆಯಿಂದ ನಡೆಯಿತು.

ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕವಿಯು ತನ್ನ ಕಲ್ಪನಾಶಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಯೋಗ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿ ಕಾವ್ಯಕ್ಕೊಂದು ಅಪೂರ್ವ ಕಳೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದು ಕವಿತಾ ಸ್ವಾರಸ್ಯವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಿದ್ದಾನೆ.

ತಾರಕಾಸುರನ ವಧೆಗೋಸ್ಕರ ದೇವತೆಗಳ ಪ್ರೇರಣೆಯಿಂದ ಶಿವನ ತಪಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಭಂಗವನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡಿ ಅತನಿಗೆ ಹಿಮಾಲಯನಗಾಧಿರಾಜನ ಮಗಳಾದ ಪಾರ್ವತಿಯ ಪಾಣಿಗ್ರಹಣವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಸಿ, ದೇವಸೇನಾನಿಯಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಅರ್ಮೋಗನ ಜನನಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಾಯಕನಾಗುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಕೈಲಾಸಪರ್ವತವನ್ನು ಮುತ್ತಿದ ಕಾಮನು ಇವನಲ್ಲ. ತನ್ನ ಪರಿವಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಚಂದ್ರನನ್ನು ಸೆರೆಹಿಡಿದ ಅಸರಾಧಿ ಶಿವನನ್ನು ದಂಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ಧನಾದ ವೀರಕಾಮನಿನನು. ಈ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಯೋಸ ಕಲ್ಪನೆಯಿಂದ ರಸ ಪುಷ್ಟಿಗೆ ತುಂಬಾ ಅನುಕೂಲ್ಯವುಂಟು. ದೇವತೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಯುದ್ಧಮಾಡುವ ಧಾರ್ಮಿಕ ಭಾವನೆಯು, ಕಾವ್ಯದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ, ಸ್ವತಃ ತನ್ನವನಾದ ಚಂದ್ರನನ್ನು ಸೆರೆಹಿಡಿದ ಅಸರಾಧದಷ್ಟು ಪರಿಣಾಮಕಾರಿಯಾಗದು. ವಿಷ್ಣು ಬ್ರಹ್ಮರನ್ನು ಸೋಲಿಸಿದಂಥ

ಕಾಮನೆ ಬಳಿಯವನಾದ ಚಂದ್ರನನ್ನು ಸೆಜಿಹಿಡಿಯುವ ದುಟ್ಟಬಡಗೊರವನಿಗೆ ಎಂಥ ಎದೆಯ ಧೈರ್ಯ? ಇಂಥ “ವಿಭಾವ”ವು ಕಾಮನನ್ನು ಕ್ರೋಧಾವಿಷ್ಟನನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ರೌದ್ರರಸವನ್ನೇರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅತಿ ಸಹಾಯಕವಾಗಿದೆ.

ಕಾಮನು ನ್ಯಾಯಸಮ್ಮತನಾದ ಸಮ್ರಾಜನು. ದೂತನಾದ ತೆಂಗಾಳಿಯನ್ನು ತನ್ನ ಸಂದೇಶದೊಡನೆ ಶಿವನಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದನು. ಶಿವನ ಒಡ್ಡೋಲಗದ ವರ್ಣನೆ — ಶಿವನಿಗೂ ತೆಂಗಾಳಿಗೂ ನಡೆದ ಸಂವಾದ — ಇಕ್ಕಡೆಯವರ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಸಾಮರ್ಥ್ಯಗಳ ತುಲನೆ — ಈ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶವು ಮುಂದೆ ಬರುವ ಘೋರಯುದ್ಧವನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತಾ ವೀರ ರಸಾಂಕುರವನ್ನು ಹೊರಹೊಮ್ಮಿಸುತ್ತದೆ.

ಯುದ್ಧವು ಒಂದು ಉಚಿತವಾದ ಕ್ರಮದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ವರ್ಣಿತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಸನ್ನಾಹ, ಪಯಣ, ಯೋಧರ ವೀರವಾದ, ಇಕ್ಕಡೆಯ ಚತುರಂಗ ಬಲಗಳೊಳಗೆ ನಡೆದ ಭಯಾಕರ ಯುದ್ಧ ಇವು ತಮ್ಮ ತಮ್ಮ ಪಾಲಿನ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ, ವೀರರಸವನ್ನುದ್ದೋಧ ಗೊಳಿಸಿ ಉಕ್ಕಿ ಹರಿಯುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತವೆ.

ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಕಾಮನಿಗೆ ದೇಹದಹನದಿಂದ ಅನಂಗತ್ವವಿಲ್ಲದೆ, ಶಿವನ ನೊಸಲರಿಯ ಪುರಾಣೋಕ್ತ ವಿನಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದೆ, ಬರಿಯ ಹೆಸರಿನ ಮಾತ್ರದ ಕೆಲವುಕಾಲ ಕಣ್ಮರೆಯಾಗಿರ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದ ಶಾಪವನ್ನು ತಂದೊಡ್ಡಿ, ದುರಂತವನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿ, ಶಿವನನ್ನು ಅರೆವೆಣ್ಣಾಗಿ ಕವಿಯು ತನ್ನ ಕಥಾನಾಯಕನನ್ನು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ “ವಿಜಯಿ” ಯಾಗಿ ಮೆರೆಯಿಸಿ ದುಡು ಬಹಳ ಪ್ರಶಂಸನೀಯವೇ ಸರಿ.

ಕಾಮನ ಪಾತ್ರರಚನೆಯೆಲ್ಲೂ ಕವಿಯು ತನ್ನ ಪ್ರತಿಭಾಕೌಶಲ್ಯವನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸಿರುವನು. ಸಕಲ ಸಂಪತ್ಸಮೃದ್ಧಿಯಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿದ ಪೂವಿನ ಪೊಳಲಿನ ರಾಯನಾದ ನನೆಯಂಬನ ಪರ್ಮೆಯು ಸಾಧಾರಣವೆ? ಇವನು ಕನ್ನಡನಾಡಿನ ಜೀವಾಧಾರನು. ಇಂಥವನನ್ನು ಕನ್ನಡನಾಡಿನ ಸಮ್ರಾಜನನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ಕನ್ನಡಿಗನಾದ ಕವಿಯ ದೇಶಾಭಿಮಾನದ ಪರಾಕಾಷ್ಠೆಯಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಇವನ ಈಗಿನ ಪೂವಿನ ಪೊಲಲೂ ಮೊದಲಿನ ಕಂಪುಮೊಲಲೂ ಎಲ್ಲೋ ಜಂಬೂದ್ವೀಪದ ಸೀತೋದಾನದಿಯ ತಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದು, ಪೌರಾಣಿಕ ಮೋಡದಿಂದ ಮಸುಕಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಕನ್ನಡಮೆನಿಪ್ಪಾನಾಡಿನೊಳಗಿದ್ದು ಐತಿಹಾಸಿಕ ದರ್ಪಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿಫಲಿಸುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಇಂಥ ಅಚ್ಚಕನ್ನಡ ನಾಡಿನೊಡೆಯನಾದ ನನೆಯಂಬನನ್ನು ತನ್ನ ಅಚ್ಚಗನ್ನಡ ಕಬ್ಬಕ್ಕೆ ಕಥಾನಾಯಕನನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದುದರಿಂದ ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನ ಕನ್ನಡತತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತಷ್ಟು ಕಳೆಯೇರಿತು. ಇವನು ‘ರಾಜನಾದಂದಿನಿಂದ ಲೋಕಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸುಭಿಕ್ಷವು. ಇವನ ಕೀರ್ತಿಯು ದಿಗಂತವನ್ನೇ ವ್ಯಾಪಿಸಿತು. ಇವನ ಬಲ್ಲು ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧರಾದ ವೀರರನ್ನು ಬೆರಗುಗೊಳಿಸಿತು. ಕಡು ನನ್ನಿಗಾರನಾಗಿ ಮರೆ ಹೊಕ್ಕವರನ್ನು ಕಾಯುತ್ತಾ, ತ್ಯಾಗಬುದ್ಧಿಯಿಂದ ಬಡವರನ್ನು ಸಲಹುತ್ತಾ ತಕ್ಕವರ ಅದರಕ್ಕೆ ಪಾತ್ರನಾದನು. ಇವನು ಅನುಪಮ ಸುಂದರನು.

ಇವನಿಗೆ ಹಿರಿಯರಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಭಕ್ತಿ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಬಸಂತಪು ಹೇಳಿದೊಡನೆಯೇ ಸವಣನಿಗೆ ನಮಸ್ಕರಿಸಿದನು. ಶಿವನು ತನ್ನ ಆಶ್ರಿತರ ಗುಂಪಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಚಂದ್ರನನ್ನು ಸೆರೆ ಹಿಡಿಯದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅಥವಾ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಬಿಡೆಂದು ತಾನು ಹೇಳಿಕಳುಹಿಸಿದಾಗ, ಬಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ, ಹಿರಿಯನಾದ ಆತನಮೇಲೂ ಯುದ್ಧಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಡುಗಲಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಸೈರಣೆಯ ಮೂರ್ತಿಯಾತನು. ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲವಾದರೆ, ದೂತನಾದ ತೆಂಗಾಳಿಯನ್ನು ಸಂಧಿ ಗೆಂದು ಶಿವನಿಡೆಗೆ ಸರ್ವಥಾ ಕಳುಹಿಸುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅನಂತರವೂ ಧರ್ಮ ಯುದ್ಧ ವನ್ನೇ ಮಾಡಿ ಶಿವನನ್ನು ಜಯಿಸಿದನು. ಆದರೆ, ಕೂಡಲೇ ತನ್ನ ಪರಾಜಯ ವನ್ನೊಪ್ಪಿ ಚಂದ್ರನನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟುಗೊಡದೆ, ಮುಂಗೋಪಿಯಾದ ಮತ್ತು ಹಿರಿಯನಾದ ಶಿವನು ತನ್ನನ್ನು ಶಪಿಸಿದುದರಿಂದ, ಕಾಮನು ತನ್ನ ಪೂರ್ವಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ತಕ್ಷಣವೇ ಮರೆತು ಅಪ್ಸರಸ್ತ್ರೀಯು ಬರುವತನಕ ತನ್ನ ಪ್ರಿಯಳಾದ ಇಚ್ಛೆಗಾರ್ತಿಯನ್ನಗಲಿ ಇರ ಬೇಕಾಯಿತು. ಆ ಅಜ್ಞಾತವಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಮನು ತನ್ನ ಮಿತ್ರನಾದ ನಗೆಗಾರನೊಡನೆ ಸ್ವೇಚ್ಛೆಯಾಗಿ ಇತರ ಕಾಮಿನಿಯರೊಡನೆ ವಿಹಾರಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಅವನ ಏಕ ಪತ್ನೀವ್ರತತ್ವವನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಂತ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಕಲ ವೈಭವಗಳಿಂದ ತನ್ನ ಇಚ್ಛೆ ಗಾರ್ತಿಯೊಡನೆ ಪಟ್ಟವಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತು ಗಾಡಿಯಿಂದೊಪ್ಪುತ್ತಾನೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ನನೆಯಂ ಬನ ಪಾತ್ರವನ್ನು ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನೊಬ್ಬ ಧೀರೋದಾತ್ತ ನಾಯಕನನ್ನಾಗಿ ಸೃಜಿಸಿದ್ದಾನೆ.

ವರ್ಣನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನದು ಎತ್ತಿದ ಕೈ. ಪ್ರಕೃತಿ ದೇವತೆಯೂ ವಾಗ್ಧೇ ವಿಯೂ ಆತನಿಗೆ ತಾವಾಗಿಯೇ ಬಂದು ಒಲಿದವರಾಗಿದ್ದರು. ಅವನೊಬ್ಬ ಉತ್ತಮಶ್ರೇ ಣಿಯ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಸೌಂದರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಚಿತ್ರಿಸುವ ಹುಟ್ಟುಕವಿ. ಐಂದ್ರಜಾಲಿಕ ವಾಗ್ವಾಹಿನಿಯಿಂದ ವಾಚಕರ ಮನಸ್ಸನ್ನು ಅವನು ಎಲ್ಲೋ ಒಂದು ರಮಣೀಯವಾದಿಡೆಗೆ ಸಾಗಿಸಿ ಬಿಡುತ್ತಾನೆ. ಪೂವಿನ ಪೊಲಲು, ಕಂಪುಪೊಲಲು, ಪೊಂಗೋಟಿ, ಮಂಜುವೆಟ್ಟ, ಮುಂತಾದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಗಳು ಅಷ್ಟು ಚೇತೋಹಾರಿಯಾದ, ಹಿತಮಿತವಚನಗಳಿಂದ ವರ್ಣಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿವೆ. ಈ ಕಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದಣ ಅವ ಉದ್ಧಾಮ ಕವಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನು ಹಿಂದುಬೀಳುವವನಲ್ಲ. ದಿಗ್ಧ ಶ್ಲೋಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಕೆಲವು ವರ್ಣನಾ ರತ್ನಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿ ಡುವೆನು.

ಮಂದಮಾರುತನು ಶೈತ್ಯ ಸೌರಭ್ಯ ಮಾಂದ್ಯ ಗುಣಗಳಿಂದ ತೀಡಿದ ತೆರನನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ—

ಚಂ|| ತಿಳಿದ ಕೊಳಂಗಳೊಳ್ ಸುಲಾದು ಸೀರ್ಪನಿಯಂ ಬಿಡದೆತ್ತಿಕೊಂಡು ಪೂ |  
 ಗಳ ಪೊಸಗಂಪಿನೊಳ್ಪೊರೆದು ತುಂಬಿಗಳಿಂಚರದಲ್ಲಿ ತಳ್ತುಕೆಂ ||  
 ದಳಿಗರ್ಗಳ ತೊಂಗಲೊಳ್ ತೊಡದು ಕೂಡುವ ನಲ್ಲರ ನೀಳ್ ಸೇದಿಯಂ |  
 ಸೆಳೆದೆಲರಲ್ಲಿ ತೀಡುವುದು ಮೆಲ್ಲನೆ ಮೆಲ್ಲನೆ ರಯ್ಯಮೆಂಬಿನಂ ||

ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಶಬ್ದಗಳ ಜೋಡಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿನಿಂದ “ ಮಂದಮಾರುತತ್ವ ” ವಿಲ್ಲವೆ? ಇಡು ಶೃಂಗಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಹಿತವಾದ ಉದ್ದೇಶನ ವಿಭಾವ!

ಇನ್ನು ತೆಂಗಾಳಿ ತನ್ನಿಚ್ಛೆಯಿಂದ ನಡೆಯುವ ಸಡಗರವನ್ನು ಸಾರಿಹೇಳುವ ಕೋಗಿಲೆಯ ವಾತಾವರಣವು ಎಷ್ಟು ಹೃದಯಹಾರಿಯಾಗಿದೆ?

ಮ|| ಕಡು ಸೊರ್ಕಿಂದಲರಂಬನಾನೆಯಿಸಿಪೀ ತೆಂಗಾಳಿ ತನ್ನಿಚ್ಛೆಯಿಂದ |  
ನಡೆತಂದಪ್ಪುದು ಬೇಗದಿಂದ ಬಿರಯಿ ನೀಂ ಪೋ ಪೋಗು ಪೋಗೆಂದು ಮುಂ ||  
ಗಡೆಯೋಳ್ ಸಾಣುವ ಡಾಡೆಯೆಂಬ ತೆಪದಿಂದ ಬಗ್ಗಿ ಸುತ್ತಿದುಂ ||  
ಗಡದಿಂದ ಕೋಗಿಲೆ ಮೊಗ್ಗೆಯಿಂದ ಮಿಡಿಗಳಿಂದ ಸೊಂಪೇಪಾದಿಮ್ನಾವಿನೋಳ್ ||

ಕಾವನಾನೆಯಂತಿರುವ ತೆಂಗಾಳಿಯ ತನ್ನಿಚ್ಛೆಯನ್ನು ವರ್ಣಿಸಲಸದಳ—

ಮ|| ತಳಿರಂ ಮೆಲ್ಲನೆ ನೂಂಕಿ ಮಾಮಿಡಿಗಳಿಂದ ಸಂಡಾಡುತುಂ ಕೂಡೆ ಪೂ |  
ಗಳ ದೂಳಿಂದ ಪೋಪಿಯೇಪುತುಂ ಸೊನೆಗಳೋಳ್ ನೀರಾಟಮುಂ ಮಾಡುತುಂ ||  
ಬಲಯಂ ಕೈಮಿಗೆ ಬರ್ಪ ತುಂಬಿಯುಲಿಯಿಂದಂ ಡಂಗುರಂ ಬೊಯ್ಸುತುಂ |  
ತಳದೇಂ ಬಂದುದೊ ಕಾವನಾನೆಯವೊಲಾ ತೆಂಗಾಳಿ ತನ್ನಿಚ್ಛೆಯಿಂದ ||

ಕಾಂಗಿಗೆ ಸುತ್ತಿದ ಎಲೆವಳ್ಳಿಗಳು ಎಲೆವಸರದಂತೆ ಶೋಭಿಸುತ್ತಿವೆಯಂತೆ. ಕಾಂಗಿನ ತೋಟಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದವರಿಗೆ ಆ ವರ್ಣನೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಹಜವಿದೆಯೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಯದಿರದು.

ಕಂ|| ಅಡರ್ಬೆಲೆವಳ್ಳಿಗಳೆಲೆಯಂ |  
ಪಿಡಿದಿರ್ದೆಗಳೊಂಗಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತರತರದಿಂದ ನೇ ||  
ರೈಡೆ ಸಮೆದೆಲೆವಸರದ ಪೋಲ್ |  
ಕಡು ಚೆಲ್ವಂ ಪಡೆದು ತೋರ್ಪುವೇ ಬನದೆಡಿಗಳ್ ||

ದಾಳಿಂಬದ ಹಣ್ಣುಗಳಿಂದೊಡೆದುಬಿದ್ದ ಕೆಂಪು ಬಿತ್ತುಗಳಿಂದ ದಾಳಿಂಬದ ಮರಗಳು ರನ್ನವಸರದಂತೆಯೂ, ಬೆಳ್ಳಾವರೆಗಳಿಂದ ತುಂಬಿದ ಕೊಳಗಳು ಕಂಚಗಾರರ ಅಂಗಡಿಗಳಂತೆಯೂ, ಬಳ್ಳಿಮಾವಿನ ಸಾಲ್ಗಳು ಸೂಳೆಗೇರಿಯಂತೆಯೂ, ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿರಲು ಆ ಬನವು ಪಟ್ಟಣದಂತೆ ಶೋಭಿಸುತ್ತಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು 104-109 ಪದ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆತಿ ಚಮತ್ಕಾರವಾಗಿಯೂ ಸುಲಭವಾಗಿಯೂ ಚಿತ್ರಿಸಿದ್ದಾನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಉಚಿತವಾದ ಅಲಂಕಾರಗಳೂ ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲಿ ತಲೆಯೆತ್ತಿ ಕಾವ್ಯದ ರಮಣೀಯತೆಯನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನ ಪ್ರತಿಭಾವೈದುಷ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಒರೆಹಚ್ಚಿ ತೋರುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಆಣಿಮುತ್ತುಗಳಲ್ಲಿವೆ.

ಕಂ|| ತೊಟ್ಟನಿದಂ ನಿಟ್ಟಿಸಿದಂ |  
 ಬಿಟ್ಟನಿದೆಂಬೊಂದು ಬಿಲ್ಲ ಬಲೈಯನಾರ್ಗಂ ||  
 ದಿಟ್ಟಿಸುವುದರಿದು ಪಗೆವರ್ |  
 ತೊಟ್ಟನೆ ಕೆಡೆದುದನೆ ಕಾಣಲುಂಟವನಿದಿರೊಳ್ || ೧೭೧ ||

ಇಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಭಾವನಾಲಂಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕವಿಯು ವಾಚ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿ-ವಿಭಾವನಾ ವಿನಾಪಿ ಸ್ಯಾತ್ ಕಾರಣಂ ಕಾರ್ಯಜನ್ಮ ಚೇತ್ (ಕಾರಣವು ತೋರದೆಯೇ ಕಾರ್ಯವಾಯಿತು.) ಅದರಿಂದ ಆತನ ಕೈಚಳಕವು ವರ್ಣನಾತೀತವೆಂಬ ಕಾವ್ಯಜೀವಾತುವಾದ ವ್ಯಂಗ್ಯಾರ್ಥ ವನ್ನೂ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಗೊಳಿಸಿರುವನು.

ಕಂ|| ತಡಿಮಿಾಱು ಬಂದು ತೆಂಕಣ |  
 ಬಡಗಣ ಕಡಲೊಂದನೊಂದು ತಾಗುವ ತೆಱದಿಂ ||  
 ಬಿಡೆ ಗಜಱು ಮಿಕ್ಕ ತಕ್ಕಿಂ |  
 ಪಡೆಯೆರಡುಂ ದೆಸೆಗೆ ಮಸಗಿ ತಾಗಿದುದತ್ತಂ || ೨೭೪ ||

ಎರಡು ಕಡೆಯ ಅಪಾರವಾದ ದಂಡುಗಳು ಒಂದಕ್ಕೊಂದು ತಾಗಿದುವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸಮುದ್ರಗಳು ಒಂದಕ್ಕೊಂದು ತಾಗಿದ ಉಪಮಾನವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದು ಪ್ರಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಉಚಿತವಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂಬುದು ಸಹೃದಯವೇದ್ಯವೇ ಆಗಿರುವುದು.

ಮ|| ಜವನಂ ಪತ್ತುವೆನೊಂಬತುಂ ಗರಮನೆಂಟುಂ ಗೊಂಟೆನೊಳ್ ಕಟ್ಟಿ ತೂ |  
 ಗುವೆನೇಲುಂಕಡಲಂ ಕಡಂಗಿ ಕುಡಿವೆಂ ತಳ್ತಾಱುಲಂ ಪೊಯ್ದು ತೂ ||  
 ಉವೆನೈದುಂ ಮೊಗಮುಳ್ಳನಂ ಕೆಡವುವೆಂ ನಾಲ್ಕುಂದಟಂ ನೂಂಕೆ ನು |  
 ಗುಂವೆನಾಂ ಮೂಱಡಿಯಿಟ್ಟನಚ್ಚೆಯೆರಡಂತೊಂದಾಗಿ ನೋಟ್ಟುನೆನ್ನಂ || ೧೭೫ ||

ಇಲ್ಲಿ ರತ್ನಾವಳಿಯೆಂಬ ಅರ್ಥಾಲಂಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕವಿಯು ನಿಬಂಧನೆಮಾಡಿ, ಉತ್ಸಾಹ ವೆಂಬ ಸ್ಥಾಯಿಭಾವವನ್ನು ಪೋಷಗೊಳಿಸಿ, ವೀರರಸವನ್ನು ಧಾರಾಳವಾಗಿ ಹರಿಯುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ಸಹೃದಯೈಕವೇದ್ಯವು.

ಕಂ|| ಅವರಿವರ ಮೈಮೆಯುಮಂ |  
 ತವರಿವರ ರೂಢಿವಡೆದ ಪೊಸ ಗಾಡಿಯುಮಂ ||  
 ತವರಿವರ ಬೇಟೆಮುಮಂ |  
 ತವರಿವರೊಳ್ಳಲ್ಲದಿಲ್ಲ ಪೆಱರೊರ್ವರೊಳಂ || ೧೭೬ ||

ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಅನ್ಯೋನ್ಯೋಪಮಾಲಂಕಾರವು ವ್ಯಂಗ್ಯವಾಗುವಂತೆ ವರ್ಣಿಸಿ ಅವರಿಬ್ಬರೂ ಲೋಕೋತ್ತರರಾಗಿದ್ದರೆಂಬ ವ್ಯಂಗ್ಯಾರ್ಥವೂ ಸ್ಫುರಿಸುವಂತೆ ಚಿತ್ರಿಸಿರುವನು.



ಉಱಿ ಕಾಯ್ದು ಬಿಸಿಲೊಳೆಮ್ಮಂ |

ಮಱಿದುಂ ಕೊಱಗಿಸದೆ ಪೊರೆದುದೆಂದೊಲವಿಂ ಬಂ ||

ದೊಗುವವೋಲ್ ತನೆಯಿಂ ಕಾ |

ಲೊಗುವ ಕಲವೆಗಳೆಲ್ಲೆಯುಂ ಸೊಗಯಿಸುಗುಂ || ೨೪ ||

ಇಲ್ಲಿಯ ಉತ್ತೇಕ್ಷಾ ಲಂಕಾರವು ಕೃತಜ್ಞತೆಯನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸುವುದು ಸ್ವಪ್ನರುಷನ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವೆಂಬ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾಜ್ಞಮರ್ಯಾದೆಯಿಂದ ಸ್ಫುರಿಸುವಂತೆ ನಿಬಿಡ್ಧವಾಗಿರುವುದು.

ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಿ:—

ಮತ್ತಮಾನಾಡೊಳ್ ಕೀಲಿಂಬುದು ಕುದುರೆಯ ಬಾಯ ಕಬ್ಬುನದೊಳ್, ಕವರಿಂಬುದು ಚೆಪ್ಪರದೊಳ್, ಬಂದಿಯೆಂಬುದು ತೊಡವಿನೊಳ್,.....ಪಿಡಿಯೆಂಬುದು ಪೆಣ್ಣಾ ನೆಯೊಳಲ್ಲದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಮತ್ತಮಾತಂ ತಾವರೆಯಂತೆ ಸಿರಿಯೊಳೊಂದಿಯುಂ ಪೊಡೆಯಲರನೆನಿಸಂ. ಸಿಡಿಲಂತೆ ಕಾಯ್ದು ನಾಂತುಂ ಬಿಸುಗದಿರನೆನಿಸಂ....

ಕಂ || ಮಾವುಗಳವು ಮಲೆವರನಂ |

ಮಾವುಗಳವೊಲುಱದೆ ಮುಱಿವುವೆಂದೊಡೆ ಕೇಳಾ ||

ಕಾವನ ಬರವಱಿದ ಬಱಿ |

ಕ್ಕಾವನ ಸೊಕ್ಕುಳುಯದಿನಿಸುಮೇನಿರ್ಪುದೇ ? || ೧೭೨ ||

ಶ್ಲೇಷಾರ್ಥ ಪದಗಳಿಗೇ ಸಂಕೋಚವಿರುವ ಕನ್ನಡಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ಲೇಷಮೂಲಕವಾದ ಪರಿಸಂಖ್ಯಾಪಿರೋಧಾಭಾಸಶ್ಲೇಷೋಪಮಾಲಂಕಾರವನ್ನೂ, ಯಮಕವೆಂಬ ಶಬ್ದಾಲಂಕಾರವನ್ನೂ ಈ ಕವಿಯು ಮೇಲಣ ಗದ್ಯಪದ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದೊಡ್ಡಿರುವುದು ಆತನ ಕನ್ನಡ ಭಾಷೆಯ ಅಸಾಧಾರಣ ಪಾಂಡಿತ್ಯವನ್ನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟಪಡಿಸತಕ್ಕದಾಗಿರುವುದು.

ಇಷ್ಟೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸೊಬಗಿನ ಸುಗ್ಗಿಯೊಳಗಿನ ಪುರುಳು ಲಕ್ಕಣ ಮೈಸಿರಿಗಳ ದೃಷ್ಟಾಂತಕ್ಕಾಯಿತು. ಆದರೆ ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನನ್ನು ನಾವಿಂದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಪ್ರೀತಿಸುವುದು ಇವುಗಳಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಬೇರೆಯಾದ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಪ್ರಬಲ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ. ಅದೇ— “ಮಾತನಾಡಿದವೊಲಂದವನಾಳ್ವರೆ ವೇಟ್ಟಿ ಬಲವು”. ಅದು ಅವನನ್ನು ಕನ್ನಡಸಾಹಿತ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಮರನನ್ನಾಗಿಸಿ, ಅವನ ಕೃತಿಗೆ “ದೇಸಿಯಗೊತ್ತು” ಎಂಬ ಬಿರುದನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ಥಕಗೊಳಿಸಿರುವುದು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು ಕುರಿತು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಿ ಆತನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕ ಗುಣಗಳನ್ನು ಗ್ರಾಹ್ಯಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು—

ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನು ಅಚ್ಚಗನ್ನಡಪದಗಳನ್ನೂ ಮತ್ತು ತದ್ಭವಪದಗಳನ್ನೂ ಮಾತ್ರ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿದ್ದಾನೆಂಬುದು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಪ್ಪತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಕನ್ನಡದ ತಿರುಳನ್ನೂ

ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯವನ್ನೂ ವೈಶಿಷ್ಟ್ಯವನ್ನೂ ವಿಶದಪಡಿಸಿದನು. ತದ್ಭವ ಪದಗಳನ್ನು ಈತನು ಹೇರಳವಾಗಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿದುದರಿಂದ “ಮಾತನಾಡಿದವೋಲಾ ಕನ್ನಡಮಂ ಪೇಟ್ಟಿ”ನೆಂಬ ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನ ಶಪಥವು ಅಕ್ಷರಶಃ ನೇರವೇರಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅನೇಕ ವಿದ್ವಾಂಸರು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಡಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಅಲೋಚಿಸಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ತದ್ಭವಪದಗಳು ದ್ರಾವಿಡಭಾಷಾಸಂಸ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಜಾತಿಯನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಕನ್ನಡಜಾತಿಗೇ ಸೇರಿ ಹೊಸಬಗೆಯನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಂಡಂತಾಗಲಿವೆ? ಅವುಗಳ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಿಂದ ಕನ್ನಡದ ಗೌರವವು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿತೆನ್ನಬಹುದಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಕನ್ನಡ ಭಾಷೆಗೆ ಅಲ್ಪವಾದರೂ ಕಂಡುಕುಂದುಗಳಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಧಾರಾಳವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಅವುಗಳು ಕನ್ನಡ ವ್ಯಾಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ತಲೆಬಾಗಿದುವು. ಒಂದೇಮಾತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನು ತದ್ಭವಗಳಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತವನ್ನು ಸೋಲಿಸಿದನು. ದೇಶ್ಯ ಪದಗಳ ಮೂಲಕ ಕನ್ನಡದ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿತ್ವವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದನು. ಆ “ಕೊಳೆ ಸಕ್ಕದಮಂ ತಂದಿ ಕ್ಕದೆ” ಕಬ್ಬವನ್ನು ರಚಿಸುವುದು ಸಾಧಾರಣ ಕಾಯಗವೆ? ಒಂದಣ ಉದ್ದಾಮ ಕವಿಗಳ ಕೆಲವು ಕೃತಿಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ, ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕ್ಲಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಪದಗಳಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿದ ಪದ್ಯಗಳೂ ವಚನಗಳೂ ಇವೆ. ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ವೃತ್ತತ್ರೆಯಿಲ್ಲದವರಿಗೆ ಹಲವೆಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈಷತ್ತಾದರೂ, ರಸಭಾವಾರ್ಥಗಳ ಸ್ಫೂರ್ತಿಯಿರಲಿ, ಶಬ್ದಾರ್ಥವೇ ಬಗೆಹರಿಯುವಂತಿಲ್ಲ. ಕವಿಚಕ್ರವರ್ತಿಯೆಂದು ಬಿರುದಾಂತ ರನ್ನಕವಿಯ ಈ ಗದ್ಯಭಾಗವೊಂದನ್ನು ಲಕ್ಷಿಸಿ.

“ಎಂದು ಕುರುಕುಲಾಂತಕಂ ಕುರುಕುಳವಿಳಯಕೇತುಂಡಭೀಕರಕ್ರೋಧಬದ್ಧಾ ನುಕಾರಿತ ಮುಖನುಂ, ಗಾಂಧಾರೀನಂದನ ಸಂಹರಣೋನ್ಮೀಲಿತ ಕರಾಳದಂತದಷ್ಟೋಷ್ಣ ವಿಕಟಬದ್ಧ ಭ್ರುಕುಟಿಭಂಗ ಭೀಷಣಲಲಾಟಚ್ಛಟನುಂ, ಕುರುವಂಶದಿಶಾಪಟ್ಟನುಂ, ಸಂಧ್ಯಾರಾಗ ಸನ್ನಿಕಾಶ ದುರ್ನಿರೀಕ್ಷ್ಯ ಕಟಾಕ್ಷವಿಕ್ಷೇಪ ಲಕ್ಷಿತನುಂ, ಪಿಂಗಾಕ್ಷ ಮಾರಣ ಕಾರಣನುಂ, ಉತ್ಪನ್ನ ಮಹೋತ್ಸವ ಚಲಾಯಮಾನ ಸ್ಫುರದಂಘ್ರಿಯುಗ್ಮನುಂ, ಕುರುಕುಲ ಪ್ರಳಯ ಜಲಧರನಿನಾದ ಗಂಭೀರೋದ್ಧಾಮಸಿಂಹನಾದಪ್ರತಿಮಪ್ರತಿಜ್ಞಾಪ್ರಚಲಿತನಿಖಿಲ ದಿಕ್ಪಕ್ವನಾಳನುಂ, ಸುಯೋಧನಾನುಜ ರುಧಿರೋದ್ಗತ ಧ್ವನಿವಿಶೇಷನುಂ, ದುರ್ರೋಧನ ವಿಶೇಷಣಾನ್ವೇಷಣಾರ್ಥ ಮಾಮಸಕಂ ಮಸಗಿ ಕುರುಕುಲಪ್ರಳಯ ಕಾಲದಂಡ ಮೆನಿಸ ನಿಜವಿಜಯಗದಾದಂಡಮನೆತ್ತಿಕೊಂಡು....”

ಇದೊಂದು ಕನ್ನಡವಚನದ ದೃಷ್ಟಾಂತ. ಮಹಾಕವಿಯಾದ ರುದ್ರಭಟ್ಟನ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಪದ್ಯವನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಿ.

ವಿಲುಠದ್ವಂಟಾಪಟಿಸ್ತಧ್ವನಿಬಧಿರಿತದಿಜ್ಞಂಡಲಂ ಕರ್ಣತಾಳಾ |

ನಿಲಲೋಲದ್ವೀಚಮಾಲಾಂಬರಸರಿಮದಕಂ ಪುಷ್ಕರೋಚ್ಚಾಟನವ್ಯಾ ||

ಕುಲಿತಬ್ರಹ್ಮಾಸನಾಂಭೋರುಹವತಿವಿತತಾಯೋಗರತ್ನಪ್ರಭಾಪಿಂ |

ಗಲಿತಸ್ವರ್ಗಾಂತರಾಳಂ ಹಿಮಗಿರಿಧವಳಂ ಬಂದುದಿಂದ್ರದ್ವಿಪೇಂದ್ರಂ || ೬೩ ||

ಈ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತವು ಕನ್ನಡವನ್ನು ಗಂಟಲೊತ್ತಿರುವ ಎಡೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾಚೀನ ಚಂಪೂಕಾವ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿ ಕಾಣಬಹುದು.

ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನು ತನ್ನ ಹೊಸಪರಿಯ ಸೊಬಗಿನಿಂದ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಸಮಾಸಪದಗಳ ಭೂಯಸ್ತ್ವದಿಂದ ನೀರಿಳಿಯದ ಗಂಟಲಿಗೆ ಸೊದೆಯ ಹೆಣ್ಣಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸುರಿದನು. ಕಬ್ಬಿಗರ ಪರ್ಮೆಯನ್ನು ಕಾಪಿಟ್ಟು “ಕಬ್ಬಿಗರ ಕಾವ”ನಾದನು. ಅವನೇ ಭಾಷೆಯು ಅಷ್ಟು ಲಲಿತವೂ ಮಧುರವೂ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಪ್ರಾಯಶಃ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಕನ್ನಡವನ್ನರಿತ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗನಿಗೆ, ಯಾವ ನಿಘಂಟುವಿನ ಸಹಾಯವಿಲ್ಲದೆಯೇ ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನ ಪರಿಚಯವು ಲಭಿಸಬಹುದೆಂದರೆ ಅತಿಶಯೋಕ್ತಿಯಾಗಲಾರದು. ದೇಶ್ಯಶಬ್ದಗಳ ಮತ್ತು ತದ್ಭವಗಳ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಎಳ್ಳಷ್ಟೂ ಕಷ್ಟಪಟ್ಟಂತಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಇನಿದಾದ ಪದಗಳು ಅವನಿಂದ ಆಯ್ದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಅಲ್ಲೇ ಕಾದಿದ್ದುವೋ ಎಂಬಂತೆ, ಕಾವ್ಯವು ಮುಗ್ಧರಿಸದೆ ಧಾರಾಳವಾಗಿ ಹರಿಯುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನು ಕಟ್ಟಿದ ವಾಕ್ಪದ್ಯಮಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಡಿದೇಶ್ಯಶಬ್ದಗಳನ್ನು ಒಂದೊಂದಾಗಿ ಉದಾಹರಿಸುವುದು ಅಸದೃಶ. ಅವುಗಳು ಹಲವು. “ನೀರ್ವೂಗಗಳ ಕಂಪಿಗೆ ಮಾಣದೆ ಮುಸುಕು ಮೊರೆವ ಪೆಣ್ಣುಂಜಿಗಳ, ತುಂಬಿಗಳ ಬಟುವಿಡಿದು ಬನದೊಳೆಡೆಯಾಡುವ ಸಬರಿಯರ, ಸಬರಿಯರ ನಡೆಯನೇಡಿಸುವಂತೆ ಮೆಲ್ಲಡಿಯಿಡುವ ಪೆಣ್ಣುಂಜಿಗಳ ಬಳಗಂಗಳ, ಗಳಗಲನೆ ಪಸರಿಸಿ ಪರಿದ ಬಯಲೊಳ್ ಬೆಳೆದ ಬಿಳಿಯ ಕರ್ಬಿನ ಕೋಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊರಲುದ್ದಮಾದೆಳನೀರ ಪೊನಲ, ನಲವಿಂ ಬೆಳೆಗೆಯ್ಗೆಯಗುವ ಪಕ್ಕಿಗಳನಲೆದು ಸೋವ ನಾಡಗಾಡಿಕಾರ್ತಿಯರ ಗಾಡಿಗೆ ಸೋಲ್ತು ನಿಲ್ಲ ಬಟ್ಟಿಗರ .... ಗಲಪವರಗಿಳಿಯ ಬಳಗಕ್ಕೆ ತವರ್ಮನೆಯಾದ ಮಾಮರದ ಕೊಂಬು ಕೊಂಬಿನೊಳ್ಳಿಡದೆ ಬಗ್ಗಿ ಪ ಕೋಗಿಲೆಗಳ ಚಿಲ್ವನೊಳಕೊಂಡಿರ್ಪ” ಕನ್ನಡಮೆನಿಸ್ಸಾನಾಡು “ಮೆಲ್ಲಲಿಂ ಪೂತಕೊಳಂಗಳಿಂ ಕೆಂಪಿಗಳಿಂ ಕಾಲೂರ್ಗಳಿಂ ಕೆಯ್ಗಳಿಂ” ಯಾವ ಕನ್ನಡಿಗನ ಮನಸ್ಸನ್ನು ತಾನೇ ಸೂರೆಗೊಳಲಾರದು? ಈ ಅಚ್ಚಗನ್ನಡದ ದಾರಿಯು ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನನ್ನು ಎಡವಿಸಿ, ಅರ್ಥಸ್ಪಷ್ಟತೆಯನ್ನು ಕೆಡಿಸಿ, ರಮಣೀಯತೆಯನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಮಟ್ಟಿಗಾದರೂ ಹೋಗಲಾಡಿಸಿದೆಯೇ? ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಗದ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಕ್ತಪದಗ್ರಾಸವೆಂಬ ಶಬ್ದಾಲಂಕಾರವು ಎಷ್ಟು ಲಲಿತವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಗಮನಿಸತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯವೇ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಪ್ರಮಾಣಕ್ಕಾದರೂ ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ತದ್ಭವಶಬ್ದವಾದರೂ ಇಲ್ಲದ ದೇಶ್ಯಪದಗಳಿಂದಲೇ ಜೀವಿಸಿರುವ ಈ ಪದ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಿ:—

ಮ|| ನನೆಯಂ ಪೇಟಾದ ತೋರಗೊಂಬು ನನೆಯಂ ಪೂಗೊಂಚಲಂ ಪೊತ್ತು ನೆ |  
 ಟ್ಪನೆ ಬಿಣ್ಣೇಟಾದ ಬಳ್ಳಿಗೊಂಬು ನನೆಯಂ ಪೂಗೊಂಚಲಂ ಕಾಯನಂ ||  
 ತನಸುಂ ತಾಳ್ವಿದ ಗುಜ್ಜುಗೊಂಬು ನನೆಯಂ ಪೂಗೊಂಚಲಂ ಕಾಯ್ಗಳಂ |  
 ತನಿವಣ್ಣಂ ತಳೆದಳ್ಳಿಗೊಂಬು ತರದಿಂ ಚೆಲ್ವಾದುದಿಮ್ಮಾವಿನೊಳ್ ||

ಆ ಇಮ್ಮಾವಿನ ಗಾಡಿಯೆಂತು? ತೋರಗೊಂಬು, ಬಳ್ಳಿಗೊಂಬು, ಗುಜ್ಜು ಗೊಂಬು  
ಅಳ್ಳಿಗೊಂಬುಗಳಂತೆ.

ಕಂ|| ಎಲೆ ತೀಡುವ ತೆಂಗಾಳಿಯೆ |  
ನಲವಿಂಕಾಲ್ವಿಡಿದು ತಿಳಿಪಿ ತಳ್ಳಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಕಾ ||  
ದಲನಂ ತಂದೊಡೆ ನಲುಸು |  
ಯ್ಯೊಲರಿಂದಂ ಸಿನ್ನನೇಗಳುಂ ನೆಹಿ ಪೊರೆವೆಂ ||

ಎಷ್ಟು ಸುಲಭವಾಗಿ ಈ ಪದ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನು ಹಾಡಿದ್ದಾನೆ? ಇಂಥವು  
ಶೃಂಗಾರರಸೋತ್ಪಾದನೆಗೆ ತಕ್ಕ ಸೋಪಾನಗಳಲ್ಲವೆ?

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಶೇಷ ಸಂಗತಿ. ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನು ಅರ್ಥವತ್ತಾಗಿರುವ ಅಚ್ಚುಕಟ್ಟಾದ  
ಸಮಸ್ತ ಪದಗಳನ್ನು ಜೋಡಿಸಿ ಕನ್ನಡದ ಮೈಸಿರಿಯನ್ನು ನಿರೇರಿಸಿರುವನು.

ಕಣ್ಣಿವಲೆ, ತಳವಟ್ಟಿ, ಚಿಂಗಣಿಲೆ, — ಇಂತಹ ಕರ್ಮಧಾರಯಗಳನ್ನೇಕ  
ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲಿ ತಲೆದೋರಿ ಕಾವ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಶೋಭೆಯನ್ನು ತರುತ್ತವೆ.

ಮನೋಹರವಾಗಿರುವ ಅಸಂಖ್ಯಾತ ಬಹುವ್ರೀಹಿಗಳು:—

ನನೆಗಣೆಯಂ, ಕಮ್ಮಂಗಣೆಯಂ, ಪೊಡೆಯಲರಂ, ಬಿಸುಗದಿರಂ

ಕಾಮನಿಗೆಷ್ಟು ಅಚ್ಚುಗನ್ನಡ ಹೆಸರುಗಳು ಪ್ರಯುಕ್ತವಾಗಿವೆ? ನೋಡಿ:—

ಐಸರಲಂ, ಕಮ್ಮಂಗಣೆಯಂ, ಕರ್ಪವಿಲ್ಲಂ, ಅರಲಂಬಂ, ನನೆಗೋಲಂ, ನನೆಗ  
ಣೆಯಂ, ನನೆವಿಲ್ಲಂ.

ಶಿವನ ಪರ್ಯಾಯನಾಮಗಳನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಿ:—

ನೆತ್ತಿಗಣ್ಣಂ, ಉರಿಗಣ್ಣಂ, ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಂ, ಕಹಿಗೊರಲಂ, ನಂಜುಗೊರಲಂ,  
ಬಾಂದೊಡಿದಲೆಯಂ.

ಸೂರ್ಯನಿಗೆ:— ಬಿಸುಗದಿರಂ, ಬಿಂಗದಿರಂ, ಪಗಲಾಣ್ಣನ್ ಮುಂತಾದ ಹಲವು  
ಅನ್ವರ್ಥನಾಮಗಳು.

ಚಂದ್ರನಿಗೆ ತಣ್ಣದಿರನೆಂದೂ ಸರಸ್ವತಿಗೆ ನುಡಿವೆಣ್ಣೆಂದೂ ಇಂದ್ರನಿಗೆ ಮೆಯ್ಗಣ್ಣ  
ನೆಂದೂ ಬ್ರಹ್ಮನಿಗೆ ನಾಲೊಗನೆಂದೂ ಪದ್ಮನಾಭನಿಗೆ ಪೊಡೆಯಲರನೆಂದೂ ಮಹಾ  
ಶೇಷನಿಗೆ ಪಲವುಂ ನಾಲಿಗೆಯುಳ್ಳವನೆಂದೂ ಹಿಮಗಿರಿಗೆ ಮಂಜುವೆಟ್ಟೆಂದೂ ಸಮು

ದ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಮುನ್ನೀರೆಂದೂ ರಕ್ತಕ್ಕೆ ಕೆನ್ನೀರೆಂದೂ ಸಾರಥಿಗೆ ಪೊಡೆವಾತನೆಂದೂ ಬಗೆ ಬಗೆಯ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಚ್ಚಗನ್ನಡಪದಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳನ್ನು ಅಮರವನ್ನಾಗಿಸಿದ್ದಾನೆ.

ಹಾಗೆಯೇ, ಪಕ್ಷಿಗಳ ಮತ್ತು ವೃಕ್ಷಗಳ ಪ್ರಭೇದಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವಲ್ಲಿಯೂ; ನಿಸ್ಸಾಳ, ತಂಬಟ, ಬೀಜವರೆ, ಡಕ್ಕೆ, ಕಾಳೆ, ದಾಡೆ, ತಮಟೆ ಮುಂತಾದ ಯುದ್ಧ ವಾದ್ಯಸನ್ನಾಹಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನು ತನ್ನ ತಿಳುವಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನೂ; ಕನ್ನಡದೇಶದ ಸೊಬಗನ್ನೂ ಚಿರಸ್ಥಾಯಿಯಾಗಿಸಿದ್ದಾನೆ. ಈ ದಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಂದಣವರು ಅಡಿಯಿಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಕನ್ನಡಶಬ್ದಗಳಿಗೆ ದಾರಿದ್ರ್ಯ ಬರುತ್ತಿತ್ತೆ ?

ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಕೊರಲ್ಗೊಳ್ (ಲೋಭಿಸು, ಕಂಠಪಾಠಮಾಡು) ಬಾಲ್ಯ ಲೆವಿಡಿದು (ಜೀವ ಗ್ರಾಹಂ ಗೃಹೀತಃ—ಸ್ವಾಣದೊಡನೆ ಸೆರೆಹಿಡಿಯಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ಅಚ್ಚಗನ್ನಡ), ತುಱ್ಱೆಲ್ಯಾ (ನಮ ಸ್ಕರಿಸು)ಮುಂತಾದ ನುಡಿಗಟ್ಟುಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಅಣಂಬಿಯ ಕೊಡೆಪೋಲ್ಬೆಳ್ಳೊಡೆಗಳಾದುವು, ಪೊನ್ನದು ಕಂಪಿತಾದ ತೆಪನಲ್ಲವೆ? ಬಡವಂ ಕಸವರಮಂಕಂಡಂತೆ, ಮುನ್ನೀರ್ ಮೇಱಿ ವರಿದಂತೆ, ಪಡಿಮೊಗಮಾಗಲೊಡಂ ಮೆಯ್ಯಂದುವರುಗ್ಗಡದರಸು ಮಕ್ಕಳ್ ಮುಂತಾದ ಮನಮುಟ್ಟುವ ಅಚ್ಚಗನ್ನಡದ ಅಲಂಕಾರಿಕ ವರ್ಣನಾವಾಕ್ಯಗಳಿಂದಲೂ, ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನು ತನ್ನ ಕಬ್ಬದ ರಮ್ಯತೆಯನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಿದ್ದಾನೆ.

ವ್ಯಾಕರಣದಲ್ಲೊಂದು ಹೊಸ ಹಜ್ಜೆಯನ್ನಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾನೆ ಅಂಡಯ್ಯ.

ಕಂ|| ಸಿರಿಯರಸಂ ಮಾದೇವಂ |

ಸರಸತಿಯೆಱಿಯರ್ಕ್ಕಳಡಿಗಳೆಂಬೀ ಕೆಂಡಾ ||

ವರೆಗಳೊರೆಗೆನ್ನಂ ಪೊಸ |

ಸಿರಿಗಂಪಿಂ ಪಱಮವಱಿಯನೆಂತೊಲವಿಂ ||

ಸಿರಿಯರಸಂ ಮಾದೇವಂ ಸರಸತಿಯೆಱಿಯರ್ಕ್ಕಳ— ಎಂದು ದ್ವಂದ್ವಸಮಾಸ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ, “ಸಿರಿಯರಸಂ ಮಾದೇವಂ” ಎಂಬ ಪೂರ್ವಪದಗಳಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಥಮಾವಿಭಕ್ತಿ ಪ್ರತ್ಯಯಗಳನ್ನು ಲೋಪಿಸಿದಿರುವುದು ವ್ಯಾಕರಣ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯ ವಿರುದ್ಧ. ಅಲುಕ್ಸಮಾಸವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದಾದರೂ, ಅಲುಕ್ಸಮಾಸವು ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧವಾದ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಎಲ್ಲೋ ಅಪೂರ್ವವಾಗಿರುವುದಲ್ಲದೆ ದ್ವಂದ್ವಸಮಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂದೂ ಕಂಡುಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ವ್ಯಸ್ತಪದವೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿ ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಶೇಷಣ ಪದಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಪ್ರಥಮಾವಿಭಕ್ತಿ ಪ್ರತ್ಯಯವಿದ್ದು ವಿಶೇಷ್ಯಪದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅನ್ವಿತವಾಗುವ ಕಾರಕವಿಭಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವ ವಿಶೇಷ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವನ್ನು ಉಪಲಕ್ಷಣವಾಗಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು “ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಿಯೆಯಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ, ನಾನುಪದದಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ ಅನ್ವಿತವಾಗುವ ಹಲವು ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರ ಪದಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆದಿಯ ಪದಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಪ್ರಥಮಾವಿಭಕ್ತಿಯಿಂದ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಿಸಿ ಕೊನೆಯ ಪದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾತ್ರ

ಅನ್ನಿತವಾಗುವ ವಚನ ಕಾರಕವಿಭಕ್ತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು” ಎಂಬ ನಿಯಮಪ್ರಚಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಈತನು ಮಾರ್ಗಪ್ರದರ್ಶಕನೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ದ್ವಂದ್ವಸಮಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂರ್ವಪದಗಳ ವಿಭಕ್ತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಲೋಪಿಸಿ ಕೊನೆಯಪದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಪ್ರಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನ್ನಿತವಾಗುವ ಕಾರಕವಿಭಕ್ತಿ ವಚನಗಳನ್ನು ಹಚ್ಚುವುದು ಕ್ರಮ. ಮತ್ತು ಭೂತಕಾಲದ ಉತ್ತಮಪುರುಷ ಸ್ತತ್ಯದ ಅದಿಯ ಎಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ವಿಕಲ್ಪದಿಂದ ದೀರ್ಘವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು “ತನಿವಣ್ಣಂ ಲಂಚಮೀವಂ.....ನಿನಗೀವೇನಂಚಿ.....” -ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಿಸಿರುವನು. ಇಂತಹ ಕನ್ನಡಕ್ಕೆ “ಅರಿದಾದ” ಲಕ್ಷಣಗಳು ಹಲವಿವೆ.

ಇನ್ನುಳಿದುದು ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನು ಹೊಯ್ಸ ಎರಕದ ರೀತಿ. ಅತನಿಗೆ ರಾಘವಾಂಕನಂತೆ ಹೊಸ ಭಂದೋಮಾರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದು, ತನ್ನ ದೇಶೀಯ ಕಬ್ಬದ ಸೊಬಗನ್ನು ರಾಯನ ನಾಲ್ಕುಳ್ಳ ಬೀರಿ, ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವದೇಶೀಯ ತತ್ವವನ್ನು ಮತ್ತಷ್ಟು ಬೆಳಗಬಹುದಿತ್ತು. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಅತನು ವರ್ಣವೃತ್ತಗಳಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿದ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಚಂಪೂ ಷ್ವೇತ್ರವನ್ನೇಕೆ ಹೊಕ್ಕನು? ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನಿಗೆ ಸಂಕುಚಿತ ಮಾತ್ಸರ್ಯಭಾವನೆಯಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದೇ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಮಾಧಾನ. ಶುದ್ಧ ಕನ್ನಡ ಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲೂ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಮಯವಲ್ಲದ ಅಚ್ಚುಗಟ್ಟಾದ ಚಂಪೂ ಗ್ರಂಥಗಳನ್ನು ಕಷ್ಟವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ರಚಿಸಬಹುದೆಂದು ತೋರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾದರೂ ಈ ಪುಟ್ಟ ಚಂಪೂ ಗ್ರಂಥವನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಮಿಸಿದನು. ಬರಿಯ ೭೭೫ ಪದ್ಯಗಳನ್ನೂ, ಸುಮಾರು ೭೫ ವಚನಗಳನ್ನೂ ಒಳಕೊಂಡ ಈ ಖಂಡಕಾವ್ಯವು ಆಶ್ವಾಸಾದಿ ವಿಭಾಗಕ್ರಮಗಳಿಲ್ಲದೆ, ಅತಿ ರಮಣೀಯವಾದ ಗತಿಯಿಂದ, ಸ್ವಲ್ಪವೂ ತಡವರಿಸದೆ, ಮುಂದೆ ಸಾಗಿ ತನ್ನ ಗುರಿಯನ್ನು ಸೇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಥಾನಾಯಕನಾದ ಕಾವನನ್ನು ಸ್ತುತಿಸಿ, ತ್ರಿಮೂರ್ತಿಗಳನ್ನು ವಂದಿಸಿ, ನುಡಿವೆಣ್ಣನ್ನು ನೆನೆದು, ಸುಕವಿಸ್ತವನವನ್ನೂ ಕುಕವಿನಿಂದೆಯನ್ನೂ ಮುಗಿಸಿ ತನ್ನ ವಂಶಾವಳಿಯನ್ನು ಸಂಕ್ಷೇಪವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿ, ೧೬ ಪದ್ಯಗಳು ಮುಗಿಯುವುದರೊಳಗೆ, ಕಥಾಂಶಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರವೇಶಮಾಡಿರುವನು. ಇದು ಅತಿಮಿತವಾದ ಪೀಠಿಕೆ.

ಕೃತಿಯ ಹದಿನೆಂಟೆಂಗಳೂ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅಷ್ಟು ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಿಲ್ಲದ “ಉದಧಿ, “ ಪರಿಣಯ”, “ ಸುತ ” ಮುಂತಾದ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ತಂದು ತುರುಕಿ, ಕಾವ್ಯದ ಹೊರೆಯನ್ನು ಹೊರದಂತೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಈತನು ಬಯಸಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥ ಲೋಪದಿಂದ ಕಾವ್ಯಲಕ್ಷಣವು ಕೆಟ್ಟೇತೆಂಬ ಭಯವಾದರೂ ಆತನಿಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಬೇಕಾದ ವರ್ಣನೆಗಳು ಸಂದರ್ಭೋಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಬಂದು ಕಥಾಸರಣಿಯನ್ನು ಕಡಿಸದೆ, ಕಾವ್ಯವು ಸುಗಮವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರವಹಿಸುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೇ ಆತನ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಅಂಗವಣಿ.

ಭಂದೋವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲೂ ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನು ಕನ್ನಡದ ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಮೆಟ್ಟಿದೆ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಗ್ಗದ ಗಾಡಿಕಾರ್ತಿಯರು ರನ್ನದಾರತಿಯನ್ನೆತ್ತುವಾಗ ಹಾಡಿದುದು ಉತ್ಸಾಹ ರಗಳೆಯ ಧಾಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ. ದ್ವಿತೀಯಾಕ್ಷರ ಪ್ರಾಸದ ನಿಯಮವಿಲ್ಲದೆ, ಹಾಡು ತಾಳ ಬದ್ಧವಾದ ಅಡಿಯನ್ನಿಡುತ್ತಾ ಅತಿಮಧುರವಾಗಿ ಮುಂದುವರಿದು, ಆರತಿಯಿಂದ ಕನ್ನಡ ನುಡಿಯನ್ನೇ

ಬೆಳಗಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಥರಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ತಿಳಿದುಬರುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಉತ್ತಮವಾದ ದೇಶ್ಯ ಛಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲೇ ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನು ಕಬ್ಬವನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟುತ್ತಿದ್ದನು. ಆದರೆ ಹಳೆಗನ್ನಡ ಚಂಪೂಗ್ರಂಥಗಳೊಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಖ್ಯಾತವಾದ ವರ್ಣವೃತ್ತಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಮಯವಲ್ಲದ ಅಚ್ಚಗನ್ನಡವನ್ನುಪಯೋಗಿಸಿ ಕಾವ್ಯವನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಬಹುದೆಂಬ ಪೂಣ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಪೂರೈಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಅವನು ಮಾಡಿರಬಹುದು.

ಆ ವರ್ಣವೃತ್ತಗಳನ್ನುಪಯುಕ್ತಮಾಡಿದಾಗ, ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನು ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿರುವ ಉತ್ಪಲಮಾಲಾದಿ ಆರು ವೃತ್ತಗಳಲ್ಲದೆ, ಸಮಯವರಿತು ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೆಲವು ವೃತ್ತಗಳನ್ನೂ ಆಯ್ದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾನೆಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆರಡು ಉದಾಹರಣೆ— ಕಾವನ ಪಡೆಯು ಪೇರಡವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮುನ್ನಡೆದ ಸೊಬಗನ್ನು ವರ್ಣಿಸುವಲ್ಲಿ

ಉತ್ಸಾ|| ತುಱುಗಿ ನಡೆದ ಮುಗಿಲ ನಡುವೆ ಪೊಳೆವ ಮಿಂಚಿದೆಂಬಿನಂ |  
ಮಿಱುಪ ತೆಱುಗಳೆಡೆಗಳೊಳಗೆ ಸುಱುವ ಮಿನ್ನಳಾವಗಂ ||  
ಮೆಱುವ ತೊಱೆಯ ತಡಿಯ ತಳಿರ ಮನೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಚ್ಚುಮುಂ |  
ಬಱಾದೆ ಮುಳಿದು ತಿಳಿಪೆ ತಿಳಿದು ನೆರೆವ ಬೇಡವೆಣ್ಣಿರಿಂ ||

ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ಸಾಹವೃತ್ತದಿಂದ ಪ್ರಕೃತ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶವನ್ನು ಚಿತ್ರಿಸಿ, ಪದ್ಯಕ್ಕೊಂದು ಯುದ್ಧಗೀತೆಯ ಕಳೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದೊಡ್ಡಿದ್ದಾನೆ. ಪದಗಳ ಜೋಡಣೆಯು ಕುಣಿಯುವಂತಿದ್ದು, ಉತ್ಸಾಹದ ಹೆಗ್ಗುರುತಾಗಿದೆ.

ಮಾಲಿನೀ|| ಬಿಡದೆಸವೆಲರಿಂದಂ ಪೊಣ್ಣುತಿರ್ಪಚ್ಚಗಂಪಂ |  
ಪಿಡಿದಲರ್ಗಳ ಜೊಂಪಂ ಜೋಲ್ದು ಚೆಲ್ವಾಗೆ ಬಿಣ್ಣೆಂ ||  
ದಿಡಿದ ಮರಗಳಿಂದಂ ಬೆಳ್ಳವೆಟ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಚ್ಚಂ |  
ಪಡಿಯೆನಿಸುವುದೆತ್ತಂ ರನ್ನಗಲ್ಲೆಂಬ ಬೆಟ್ಟಂ ||

ಮಾಲಿನೀವೃತ್ತವು ಕಾವನ ಪಡೆಗೆ ಬೆಟ್ಟವನ್ನೇರುವ ಪ್ರಸಂಗವು ಬಂದಿತೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ತನ್ನ ಗುರುಲಿಘನಿನ್ಯಾಸಪೂರ್ವಕವಾದ ಮೆಲ್ಲಡಿಗಳಿಂದ ತೋರಿಸುವಂತಿದೆ.

ಇಂತು— ಕನ್ನಡ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯವು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದ ಒಪ್ಪವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಶೋಭಿಸಬಲ್ಲದು, ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ ತಿರುಳುಪುರುಳುಗಳಿವೆ, ಕನ್ನಡಕ್ಕೊಂದು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿತ್ವವಿದೆ ಎಂಬ ನವಸಂದೇಶವನ್ನು ಅಂಡಯ್ಯನು ವಿಷಯರೀತಿಗಳೆರಡಲ್ಲೂ ತನ್ನದೇ ಆದ ಒಂದು ಹೊಸಪರಿಯ ಕಬ್ಬದಿಂದ ಕನ್ನಡ ನಾಡಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವನು. ಅದೊಂದು ಕನ್ನಡಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂದ ಅಪೂರ್ವ ಸೇವೆ. ಅಂಥ ವೀರರು ಬಹುಮಂದಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೇಹೋದುದು ಕನ್ನಡನುಡಿಯ ದುರ್ಬಲವೆನಿಸುವ ವಿಲಾಸ.

## ON PAMPA'S WORKS

By

H. SESA AYYANGAR.

This is a continuation of the articles which appeared in the two previous numbers of the "Annals." In them the meanings of four words Agunti, Ollaṇige, Sūyāṇa, Tegaḷige were discussed and in this number the meanings of three more words Lataha, Mūri and Kirāta have been discussed.





1 ವಸ್ತುವನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಥವಾ ನಟನಿಗೆ ಉಪಯುಕ್ತವಾಗುವ ಯಾವುದಾದರೊಂದು ವಸ್ತುವೆಂದು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಾದರೂ ನಟನಿಗೆ 2 ಉಪಯುಕ್ತವಾಗತಕ್ಕ ವಸ್ತುಗಳು ಹಲವಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದವಾಚ್ಯವಾದುದು ಯಾವ ವಸ್ತುವೆಂದು ನಿಷ್ಕೃಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಶಕ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗೆ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಧರ್ಮವಾಚಕವಾದ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸಮಂಜಸವಲ್ಲವಾದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದಾದರೊಂದು ಧರ್ಮವೆಂದು ಅರ್ಥಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಆ ಧರ್ಮವಾದರೂ ಯಾವುದೆಂದು ನಿರ್ಧರಿಸಿ ಹೇಳಲು ಪ್ರಕೃತಪ್ರಯೋಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ನಿಷ್ಕೃಷ್ಟವಾದ ಆಧಾರವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಇನ್ನು 2ನೆಯ "ಲಟಹಯುತಂಗಳ್" ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಲ್ಲೂ ಮೇಲಣಪ್ರಯೋಗದಂತೆಯೇ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದವು ಯುತ (ಸೇರಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ) ಎಂಬ ಪದದೊಡನೆ ಅನ್ವಿತವಾಗುವ ಕಾರಣ ಈ ಪ್ರಕರಣಬಲದಿಂದ ಯಾವ ವಿಶೇಷಾರ್ಥವೂ ತೋರಿಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ 'ಲಟಹಯುತಂಗಳ್' ಎಂಬೀ ಶಬ್ದಾರ್ಥವು 'ತದಮರಚಮರರುಹಂಗಳ್' ಎಂಬ ಶಬ್ದಾರ್ಥವನ್ನು ವಿಶೇಷಿಸುವುದರಿಂದ ಚಾಮರಗಳು ಲಟಹದಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿದುವು ಎಂಬ ಅರ್ಥವು ಪ್ರಕೃತಪ್ರಯೋಗದಲ್ಲಿ ತೋರಿಬರುವುದು. ಹಿಂದಣ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಲ್ಲಿ ನಟನು ಮಹಾಲಟಹದೊಡನೆ ಕೂಡಿದ್ದವನು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚಾಮರಗಳು ಲಟಹದೊಡನೆ ಕೂಡಿರುವುವು ಎಂಬ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳಿದಂತಾಯಿತು. ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಚಾಮರಗಳು ಅತ್ತಿತ್ತ ಸಂಚರಿಸುವುದರಿಂದ ಕವಿಯು ವೃಜ್ಯಮರ್ಯಾದೆಯಿಂದ ನಟನ ಆಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಿರುವನು ಎಂದು ತೋರಿಬರುವುದು. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದಾರ್ಥವು ಈ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲೂ ನಟನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಯಾವುದಾದರೊಂದು ಧರ್ಮವಾಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂದೇ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದು.

ಇನ್ನು ಮೂರನೆಯದಾದ "ವಾರವಿಲಾಸಿನೀ ಲಟಹನರ್ತನಚಂಚಳಕಾಂಚಿದಾಮಮಂ | ಜೀರಕಕಿಂಕಿಣೀಕ್ಷಣಿತದಿಂ" ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದವು ನರ್ತನ ಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿಶೇಷಣವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಯುಕ್ತವಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಿಶೇಷಣವನ್ನು ಸಮಾನಾಧಿಕರಣವಿಶೇಷಣವಾಗಿ ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸುವುದಾದರೆ ಅದು ಧರ್ಮವಾಚಕವಾಗಬೇಕಾಗುವುದು. ಆದರೆ ಹಿಂದಣ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಧರ್ಮವಾಚಕವಾದರೆ ಅನ್ವಯವು ಲಭಿಸಲಾರದೆಂದು ವಿಮರ್ಶಿಸಿ ಧರ್ಮವಾಚಕವಾಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ

1. ಲೋಕಾಕಾರವನ್ನು ವರ್ಣಿಸಿರುವ ಈ ಗ್ರಂಥಸ್ಥವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಮಹಾಪುರಾಣವು ಆಧಾರವಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಲೋಕಾಕಾರವು ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಿರುವುದು. "ವೈಶಾಖಸ್ಥಃ ಕಟಿನ್ಯಸ್ತಪಸ್ತಃ ಸ್ಯಾತ್ ಯಾದೃಶಃ ಪುರ್ವಾ ಿತಾದೃಶಂ ಲೋಕಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಮಾಮನಂತಿ ಮನೀಷಿಣಃ" (ವೈಶಾಖಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಂತವನೂ ಸೊಂಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಕೈಗಳನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟವನೂ ಆದ ಗಂಡುಸೊಬ್ಬನು ಯಾವ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವನೋ ಆ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನೇ ಲೋಕಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೂ ತಿಳಿದವರು ಹೇಳುವರು.) ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದದ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವನೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಪಂಪನು ಸ್ವಂತವಾಗಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿರುವನು.

2. ಒಡನೆ, ವಸ್ತ್ರ ನಾಟ್ಯೋಪಕರಣ ಮೊದಲಾದ ಹಲವು ವಸ್ತುಗಳು ನಟನಿಗೆ ತಕ್ಕವಾಗಿರುವುವು.

ಇದನ್ನು ಧರ್ಮವಾಚಕನೆಂದೇ ಭಾವಿಸಿ ವೈದಿಕರಣವಿಶೇಷಣವನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಲಟಹ ದಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿದ ನರ್ತನ ಎಂದು ಹಿಂದಣ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಂತೆಯೇ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿರು ವುದು. ಆದರೂ ಇದರ ನಿಷ್ಕೃಷ್ಟಾರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ತಿಳಿಯಲು ಯಾವ ಬಗೆಯ ಸೂಚ ನೆಗಳೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕಂಡುಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಪ್ರಕರಣವು ನರ್ತನಕ್ಕೇ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಪಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿರುವುದು.

ಮೇಲೆಹೇಳಿರುವ ಆದಿಪುರಾಣದ ಮೂರು ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಈ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದದ ನಿಷ್ಕೃಷ್ಟಾರ್ಥವು ತಿಳಿದುಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ನಾವು ಇತರರಾದ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಮಹಾಕವಿಗಳ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಿಂದಲಾದರೂ ಇದರ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಊಹಿಸಬಹುದೇ? ಎಂದು ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಮಹಾಕವಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆದಿಪಂಪನೊಡನೆ ಕವಿರತ್ನತ್ರಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬನಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಶಸ್ತನಾಗಿರುವ ರನ್ನನು ತನ್ನ ಗದಾಯುದ್ಧದಲ್ಲಿ-

ಮ|| ಸ್ಮರಸಂಜೀವನ ಕೃಷ್ಣ ಹೂಮುಡಿವಳಾ ಶೃಂಗಾರಮಾ ಭಾವಮಾ |  
 ಪರಿಜಾ ವಿಭ್ರಮಮಾ ಬೆಡಂಗು ನೆಗಟ್ಟಾ ಸೌಂದರ್ಯಮಾ ಬಿಂಕಮಾ ||  
 ತರಳಾಪಾಂಗವಿಲಾಸಮಾ ಲಟಹಮಾಲಾವಣ್ಯಮಾಪುಣ್ಯ? ಮಾ |  
 ದರಹಾಸಾಮೃತಮೇಂ ಮನಂಗೊಳಿಸಿತೋ ಚಾಳುಕ್ಯಕಂದರ್ಪನಂ ||

(ಆ. ಲ. ಪ. ೫೦.)

ಈ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವನು. ಈ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಕವಿಯು ದ್ರೌಪ ದಿಯ ರೂಪಾತಿಶಯ ಶೃಂಗಾರಚೇಷ್ಟಾದಿಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಣಿಸಿರುವನು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಶೃಂಗಾರಚೇಷ್ಟೆ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ತಕ್ಕಮು ಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಬಹುದೆಂದು ತೋರುವುದು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಭಾವ, ವಿಭ್ರಮ, ಬೆಡಂಗು, ಸೌಂದರ್ಯ, ಬಿಂಕ, ತರಳಾಪಾಂಗವಿಲಾಸ, (ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕಣ್ಣಿನ ವಿಲಾಸವನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳಿದಂತಾಗಿದೆ.) ಲಾವಣ್ಯ, ದರಹಾಸಾಮೃತ ಇವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ವಿಲಾಸ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದೆಂದು ತೋರುವುದು.

ಈ ಗದಾಯುದ್ಧವನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ನಮಗೆ ಉಪಲಬ್ಧವಾಗಿರುವ ಜೈನ ಪುರಾಣಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನೇಮಿನಾಥಪುರಾಣಕರ್ತೃವಾದ (ಅರ್ಥನೇಮಿಪುರಾಣವೆಂದು ಮುದ್ರಿತ ವಾಗಿರುವ ಗ್ರಂಥ) ನೇಮಿಚಂದ್ರನು ತನ್ನ ನೇಮಿನಾಥಪುರಾಣದ ಪೀಠಿಕಾಪ್ರಕರಣ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟದೇವತಾಸ್ತುತಿರೂಪವಾದ ಮಂಗಳವನ್ನು ಆಚರಿಸುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ-

ಮ|| ಸ್ಫುಟವಾದಂ ಪವಣಾಗೆ ಜಾತ್ಯಭಿನಯಂ ಚೆಲ್ವಾಗೆ ಸದ್ವರ್ತನಂ |  
 ದಿಟಮಾಗುತ್ತಿರೆ ಕೂಡೆ ಕೋಮಳಪದೋಪನ್ಯಾಸಮುದ್ಧಂಡವಾ ||  
 ಕ್ವಟುಗಳ್ ಸೋಲೆ ವಿಭೂಷಣಂ ತೊಳಗೆ ತತ್ಸ್ಯಾದ್ವಾದವಿದ್ಯಾನ(ಟ)ಟೀ |  
 (ಛ)ಲಟಹಂ ರಂಜಿಸುತಿರ್ಕ ತಾರ್ಕಿಕಮುಖಾಂಭೋಜಾತರಂಗಾಗ್ರದೊಳ್||೧೦

ಎಂಬ ಪದ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ-ನಟೀಲಟಹಂ-ನಟಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಲಟಹವು ತಾರ್ಕಿಕಜಿಹ್ವಾ ಗ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರ್ತಿಸಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವನು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದವು, ವಿಶೇಷ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಯುಕ್ತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಈ ಶಬ್ದದ ನಿಷ್ಕೃಷ್ಟಾರ್ಥವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಯಲು ಯಾವ ಆಧಾರವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಧರ್ಮವಾಚಕವೋ ಧರ್ಮಿವಾಚಕವೋ ಎಂಬ ಸ್ಥೂಲಸಂದೇಹವಾದರೂ ನಿವೃತ್ತವಾಗಬಹುದು ಎಂಬ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷೆಗೋ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲವಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಇನ್ನು ನಮಗೆ ತಿಳಿದಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತಾವ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಮಹಾ<sup>1</sup>ಕವಿಯೂ ಈ ಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ಕಂಡುಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಹೀಗೆ 1 ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಶಬ್ದವಾಗಿರುವ ಈ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದಾರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಮಹಾಕವಿಗಳ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಿಂದ ನಿರ್ಣಯಿಸಲು ಶಕ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲದಿರುವಾಗ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಮಹಾಕವಿಗಳ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳನ್ನಾದರೂ ಅರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅದರಿಂದಲಾದರೂ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಇದರ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಣಯಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಗ್ರಂಥಗಳಲ್ಲಿ (ಕಾವ್ಯಾದಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ) ವೈದಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಪದಾಯದ ಕಾಳಿದಾಸ, ಭಾರವಿ, ಮಾಘ ಮೊದಲಾದ ಮಹಾಕವಿಗಳು ಈ ಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ತಿಳಿದುಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಕಾಳಿದಾಸನಿಗೆ ಸಮಕಾಲಿಕನೆಂದು ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧನಾಗಿರುವ ಭವಭೂತಿಯು ತನ್ನ ಮಾಲತೀಮಾಧವವೆಂಬ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಏಳನೆಯ ಅಂಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾಕೃತವಾಕ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವನು.—“ಲವಂಗಿಕಾಕಹಂ ಜಾನು ಣವನಧೂವಿಸ್ಸಂಭಣೋನಾಯ ಜಾಣುಅಂ ಲಡಹಂ ವಿಆದ್ಧಂ ಮಹುರಭಾಸಿಣಂ ಆರೋಸಣಂ ದೆ ಭಾತರಂ” (ಅಂ ೭)—ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾರನು ಲಡಹಂ-ಸುಂದರಂ ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿರುವನು. ಇದು ಧರ್ಮಿವಾಚಕವೇ ಆಗಿರುವುದು. ಪ್ರಾಯಶಃ ಈ ಪ್ರಯೋಗವೇ ಹೇಮಚಂದ್ರನ ದೇಶೀಯನಾಮಮಾಲಾ ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಾಕೃತನಿಘಂಟುವಿಗೂ ಆಧಾರವಾಗಿರಬಹುದು.

ಸು. 10 ನೆಯ ಶತಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿಯೆ ರಾಜಶೇಖರಮಹಾಕವಿಯು ತನ್ನ ಬಾಲರಾಮಾಯಣ ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲಿ—

1. ಪೊನ್ನ, ಅಗ್ಗಳ ಮೊದಲಾದವರು (ನೇಮಿಚಂದ್ರ ಮತ್ತು ಜನ್ನ ಇವರ ಪ್ರಯೋಗವನ್ನು ಉಪಸಂಹಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ.)

2. ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದವು ಮಹಾಲಟಹ ಎಂಬಲ್ಲಿ ಮಹತ್ತಂಬ (ಮಹಾ) ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದ ಪೂರ್ವಪದವೊಡನೆ ಸಮಾಸವಾಗಿದೆ. ಲಟಹಯುತಂಗಳ್—ಎಂಬಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಯುತವೆಂಬ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದ ಉತ್ತರಪದವೊಡನೆ ಸಮಾಸವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದಿದೆ. ವಾರವಿಲಾಸಿನೀಲಟಹನರ್ತನ—ಎಂಬಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂರ್ವೋತ್ತರಪದಗಳೆರಡೂ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಪದಗಳಾಗಿ ಸಮಾಸವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದಿವೆ. ವಿದ್ಯಾನಟೀಲಟಹಂ—ಎಂಬಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ನಟೀ ಎಂಬ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಪದವೊಡನೆ ಸಮಾಸವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಪ್ರಾಕೃತಗ್ರಂಥಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇದು ಪ್ರಯುಕ್ತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ ಈ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದವು ಶುದ್ಧ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಪದವೆಂದೇ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದು.

ಇದನ್ನು ಧರ್ಮವಾಚಕನೆಂದೇ ಭಾವಿಸಿ ವೈದಿಕರಣವಿಶೇಷಣವನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಲಟಹ ದಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿದ ನರ್ತನ ಎಂದು ಹಿಂದಣ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಂತೆಯೇ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಆದರೂ ಇದರ ನಿಷ್ಕೃಷ್ಟಾರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ತಿಳಿಯಲು ಯಾವ ಬಗೆಯ ಸೂಚನೆಗಳೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕಂಡುಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಪ್ರಕರಣವು ನರ್ತನಕ್ಕೇ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿರುವುದು.

ಮೇಲೆಹೇಳಿರುವ ಆದಿಪುರಾಣದ ಮೂರು ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಈ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದದ ನಿಷ್ಕೃಷ್ಟಾರ್ಥವು ತಿಳಿದುಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ನಾವು ಇತರರಾದ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಮಹಾಕವಿಗಳ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಿಂದಲಾದರೂ ಇದರ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಊಹಿಸಬಹುದೇ? ಎಂದು ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಮಹಾಕವಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅದಿಪಂಪನೊಡನೆ ಕವಿರತ್ನತ್ರಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬನಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಶಸ್ತನಾಗಿರುವ ರನ್ನನು ತನ್ನ ಗದಾಯುದ್ಧದಲ್ಲಿ -

ಮ|| ಸ್ಮರಸಂಜೀವನೆ ಕೃಷ್ಣ ಹೂಮುಡಿದಳಾ ಶೃಂಗಾರಮಾ ಭಾವಮಾ |  
ಪರಿಜಾ ವಿಭ್ರಮಮಾ ಬೆಡಂಗು ನೆಗಟ್ಟಾ ಸೌಂದರ್ಯಮಾ ಬಿಂಕಮಾ ||  
ತರಳಾಪಾಂಗವಿಲಾಸಮಾ ಲಟಹಮಾಲಾವಣ್ಯಮಾಪುಣ್ಯ? ಮಾ |  
ದರಹಾಸಾಮೃತಮೇಂ ಮನಂಗೊಳಿಸಿತೋ ಚಾಳುಕ್ಯಕಂದರ್ಪನಂ ||

(ಆ. ಲ. ಪ. ೫೦.)

ಈ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವನು. ಈ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಕವಿಯು ದ್ರೌಪದಿಯ ರೂಪಾಂತರಿಯ ಶೃಂಗಾರಜೇಷ್ಠಾದಿಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಣಿಸಿರುವನು. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಶೃಂಗಾರಜೇಷ್ಠೆ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ತಕ್ಕಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಬಹುದೆಂದು ತೋರುವುದು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಭಾವ, ವಿಭ್ರಮ, ಬೆಡಂಗು, ಸೌಂದರ್ಯ, ಬಿಂಕ, ತರಳಾಪಾಂಗವಿಲಾಸ, (ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕಣ್ಣಿನ ವಿಲಾಸವನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳಿದಂತಾಗಿದೆ.) ಲಾವಣ್ಯ, ದರಹಾಸಾಮೃತ ಇವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ವಿಲಾಸ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದೆಂದು ತೋರುವುದು.

ಈ ಗದಾಯುದ್ಧವನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ನಮಗೆ ಉಪಲಬ್ಧವಾಗಿರುವ ಜೈನ ಪುರಾಣಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನೇಮಿನಾಥಪುರಾಣಕರ್ತೃವಾದ (ಅರ್ಥನೇಮಿಪುರಾಣವೆಂದು ಮುದ್ರಿತವಾಗಿರುವ ಗ್ರಂಥ) ನೇಮಿಚಂದ್ರನು ತನ್ನ ನೇಮಿನಾಥಪುರಾಣದ ಪೀಠಿಕಾಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟದೇವತಾಸ್ತುತಿರೂಪವಾದ ಮಂಗಳವನ್ನು ಆಚರಿಸುವ ಸೂತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ -

ಮ|| ಸ್ಫುಟನಾದಂ ಪವಣಾಗೆ ಜಾತ್ಯಭಿನಯಂ ಚೆಲ್ವಾಗೆ ಸದ್ವರ್ಷನಂ |  
ದಿಟಮಾಗುತ್ತಿರೆ ಕೂಡೆ ಕೋಮಳಪದೋಪನ್ಯಾಸಮುದ್ಧಂಡವಾ ||  
ಕೃಟುಗಳ್ ಸೋಲೆ ವಿಭೂಷಣಂ ತೊಳಗೆ ತತ್ಸ್ಯಾದ್ವಾದವಿದ್ಯಾನ(ಟ)ಟೇ |  
(ಛ)ಲಟಹಂ ರಂಜಿಸುತಿರ್ಕೆ ತಾರ್ಕಿಕಮುಖಾಂಭೋಜಾತರಂಗಾಗ್ರದೊಳ್||೧೦

ಎಂಬ ಪದ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ-ನಟೀಲಟಹಂ-ನಟಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಲಟಹವು ತಾರ್ಕಿಕಜಿಹ್ವಾ ಗ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ನರ್ತಿಸಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವನು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದವು, ವಿಶೇಷ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಯುಕ್ತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಈ ಶಬ್ದದ ನಿಷ್ಕೃಷ್ಟಾರ್ಥವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಯಲು ಯಾವ ಆಧಾರವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಧರ್ಮವಾಚಕವೋ ಧರ್ಮಿವಾಚಕವೋ ಎಂಬ ಸ್ಥೂಲಸಂದೇಹವಾದರೂ ನಿವೃತ್ತವಾಗಬಹುದು ಎಂಬ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಣೆಗೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲವಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಇನ್ನು ನಮಗೆ ತಿಳಿದಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತಾವ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಮಹಾಕವಿಯೂ ಈ ಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ಕಂಡುಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಹೀಗೆ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಶಬ್ದವಾಗಿರುವ ಈ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದಾರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಮಹಾಕವಿಗಳ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಿಂದ ನಿರ್ಣಯಿಸಲು ಶಕ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲದಿರುವಾಗ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಮಹಾಕವಿಗಳ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳನ್ನಾದರೂ ಆರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅದರಿಂದಲಾದರೂ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾದಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಇದರ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಣಯಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಗ್ರಂಥಗಳಲ್ಲಿ (ಕಾವ್ಯಾದಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ) ವೈದಿಕ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯದ ಕಾಳಿದಾಸ, ಭಾರವಿ, ಮಾಘ ಮೊದಲಾದ ಮಹಾಕವಿಗಳು ಈ ಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ತಿಳಿದುಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಕಾಳಿದಾಸನಿಗೆ ಸಮಕಾಲಿಕನೆಂದು ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧನಾಗಿರುವ ಭವಭೂತಿಯು ತನ್ನ ಮಾಲತೀಮಾಧವವೆಂಬ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಏಳನೆಯ ಅಂಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾಕೃತವಾಕ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಲಡಹಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವನು.—“ಲವಂಗಿಕಾ ಕಹಂ ಜಾಮು ಣವವಧೂವಿಸ್ಸಂಭಣೋನಾಯ ಜಾಣುಅಂ ಲಡಹಂ ವಿಅದ್ಧಂ ಮಹುರಭಾ ಸಿಣಂ ಅರೋಸಣಂ ದೆ ಭಾತರಂ” (ಅಂ ೭) --ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾಕಾರನು ಲಡಹಂ-ಸುಂದರಃ ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿರುವನು. ಇದು ಧರ್ಮಿವಾಚಕವೇ ಆಗಿರುವುದು. ಪ್ರಾಯಶಃ ಈ ಪ್ರಯೋಗವೇ ಹೇಮಚಂದ್ರನ ದೇಶೀಯನಾಮಮಾಲಾ ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಾಕೃತನಿಘಂಟುವಿಗೂ ಆಧಾರವಾಗಿರಬಹುದು.

ಸು. 10 ನೆಯ ಶತಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ರಾಜಶೇಖರಮಹಾಕವಿಯು ತನ್ನ ಬಾಲರಾಮಾಯಣ ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲಿ—

---

1. ಪೊನ್ನ. ಅಗ್ಗಳ ಮೊದಲಾದವರು (ನೇಮಿಚಂದ್ರ ಮತ್ತು ಜನ್ನ ಇವರ ಪ್ರಯೋಗವನ್ನು ಉಪಸಂಹಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ.)

2. ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದವು ಮಹಾಲಟಹ ಎಂಬಲ್ಲಿ ಮಹತ್ವೆಂಬ (ಮಹಾ) ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದ ಪೂರ್ವಪದದೊಡನೆ ಸಮಾಸವಾಗಿದೆ. ಲಟಹಯುತಂಗಳ್—ಎಂಬಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಯುತವೆಂಬ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದ ಉತ್ತರಪದದೊಡನೆ ಸಮಾಸವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದಿದೆ. ವಾರವಿಲಾಸಿನೀಲಟಹನರ್ತನ—ಎಂಬಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂರ್ವೋತ್ತರಪದಗಳೆರಡೂ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಪದಗಳಾಗಿ ಸಮಾಸವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದಿವೆ. ವಿದ್ಯಾನಟೀಲಟಹಂ—ಎಂಬಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ನಟೀ ಎಂಬ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಪದದೊಡನೆ ಸಮಾಸವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಪ್ರಾಕೃತಗ್ರಂಥಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇದು ಪ್ರಯುಕ್ತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ ಈ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದವು ಶುದ್ಧ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಪದವೆಂದೇ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದು.

ಲಕ್ಷೀಕರ್ತುಂ ಪ್ರವೃತ್ತೋಽಸಿ ಲಾಟೀಲಟಿಹವೀಕ್ಷಿತ್ಯೈಃ |

ಲಕ್ಷೀಭವತಿ ಕಂದರ್ಪಃ ಸ್ತೇಷಾಮೇವಾತ್ರ ಪತ್ರಿಣಾಮ್ || (ಅ. ೧೦. ಪ. ೭೯.)

ಎಂದು ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವನು. ಈ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದವು ವೀಕ್ಷಿತಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿಶೇಷಣವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ನೇತ್ರಧರ್ಮವಾಗಿರುವ ಸುಂದರ, ಚಂಚಲ, ವಕ್ರ ಅಥವಾ ವಿಲಾಸ ಎಂಬ ಧರ್ಮವಾಚಕಪದವನ್ನಾಗಿಯೇ ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದು.

ಜೈನಕವಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸು. ೧೦ನೆಯ ಶತಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ 1 ಸೋಮದೇವನೆಂಬ ಕವಿಯು ಬರೆದಿರುವ “ ಯಶಸ್ವಿಲಕಂ ” ಎಂಬ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಚಂಪುಕಾವ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ—

ಲಟಿಹೈಃ ಯುವತಿಕಟಾಕ್ಷೈಃ ಗಾಢಮಗುರುತಾಂ ಜನಃ ಸ್ವಯಂ ನೀತಃ |

ಚಿತ್ರಮಿದಂ ನನು ಯತ್ತಾಂ ಪಶ್ಯತಿ ಗುರುಬಂಧುಮಿತ್ರೇಷು || (೧-೮೦)

ಇಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯಸ್ತವಾಗಿರುವ ಲಟಿಹೈಃ ಎಂಬ ತೃತೀಯಾಬಹುವಚನಾಂತಶಬ್ದವು ಯುವತಿಕಟಾಕ್ಷೈಃ ಎಂಬ ತೃತೀಯಾಬಹುವಚನಾಂತಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿಶೇಷಣವಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯಸ್ತಪದವಾಗಿದ್ದುಕೊಂಡು ಸಮಾನಾಧಿಕರಣವಿಶೇಷಣವಾಗಿರುವ ಈ ಪದವು ಧರ್ಮವಾಚಕವಾಗಿಯೇ ಇರಬೇಕಾಗುವುದು. ಯುವತಿಯರ ಕಟಾಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ವಿಶೇಷಣವಾಗಿರುವ ಈ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಯುವತಿಯರ ಕಟಾಕ್ಷದ ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ಧರ್ಮವನ್ನುಳ್ಳದು ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುವುದು. ಯುವತಿಯರ ಕಟಾಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ

1. ಈ ಸೋಮದೇವಕವಿಯು ಚಾಳುಕ್ಯರಾಜನಾದ (ಅದಿಪಂಪನ ಪೋಷಕನಾದ) ಅರಿಕೇಸರಿಯ ಮಗನಾಗಿ ಈ ಗ್ರಂಥವನ್ನು ಬರೆದಂತೆ ಆ ಗ್ರಂಥದ ಕೊನೆಯ ಗದ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವನು.

ಶಕನ್ಯಸ ಕಾಲಾತೀತಸಂವತ್ಸರಶತೇಷ್ವಸ್ವಸ್ತೇಕಾರೀತ್ಯಧಿಕೇಷು ಗತೇಷು (ಅಜ್ಞತೋ ಲಲಂ) ಸಿದ್ಧಾರ್ಥಸಂವತ್ಸರಾಂತರ್ಗತ ಚೈತ್ರಮಾಸಮದನತ್ರಯೋದಶ್ಯಾಂ ಪಾಂಡ್ಯಸಿಂಹಲಚೋಲಚೇರಮಪ್ರಭೃತೀಃ ಪ್ರಸಾಧ್ಯ ಮೆಲ್ಯಾಟೀಪ್ರವರ್ಧಮಾನರಾಜ್ಯಪ್ರಭಾವೇ ಶ್ರೀಕೃಷ್ಣರಾಜದೇವೇ ಸತಿ ತತ್ಪಾದಪದ್ಮೋಪಜೀವಿನಃ ಸಮಧಿಗತಪಂಚಮಹಾಶಬ್ದಮಹಾಸಾಮಂತಾಧಿಪತೀಃ ಚಾಲುಕ್ಯಕುಲಜನ್ಮನಃ ಸಾಮನ್ವಜೊಡಾಮಣೇಃ ಶ್ರೀಮದರಿಕೇಸರಿಣಃ ಪ್ರಥಮಪುತ್ರಸ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀಮದ್ವಾಗರಾಜಪ್ರವರ್ಧಮಾನವಸುಧಾರಾಯಾಂ (ಇದು ಈಗಣ ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗಾ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿರುವ-ವಸ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂಬ ಊರಾಗಿರಬಹುದು.) ಗಂಗ(ಧಾ)ಧರಾಯಾಂ (ಇದು ಪ್ರಾಯಶಃ ಗಂಗವಾಡಿ ತೊಂಭತ್ತಾಱುಸಾರಿವಿರಬಹುದು.) ವಿನಿರ್ಮಾಪಿತಮಿದಂ ಕಾವ್ಯಂ || ಇತಿಸಕಲತಾರ್ಕಿಕಚೊಡಾಮಣೇಃ ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ನೇಮಿದೇವಭಗವತಃ ಶಿಷ್ಯೋಣ ಸದ್ಯೋನವದ್ಯ ಗದ್ಯಪದ್ಯ ವಿದ್ಯಾಧರಚಕ್ರವರ್ತಿ ಶಿಖಂಡಮಂಡನೀಭವಚ್ಚರಣಕಮಲೇನ ಶ್ರೀಸೋಮದೇವಸೂರಿಣಾ ವಿರಚಿತೇ ಯಶೋಧರಮಹಾಚರಿತೇ ಯಶಸ್ವಿಲಕಾಪರನಾಂನಿ ಮಹಾಕಾವ್ಯೇ ಧರ್ಮಾಮೃತನರ್ಷಮಹೋತ್ಸವೋನಾಮಾಪ್ನುಮಾಶ್ವಸಃ ||

ಅಬ್ಬೇ ಸುಧಾಂಶುಯುಗಸಿದ್ಧಧರಾಯತೇಽಸ್ಮಿನ್ ಶುಕ್ರಾನುಜನ್ಮನಿ ಶುಭೇ ಯುಗಪಕ್ಷಕೇ ಚ ||

ದರ್ಶಾತಿಥಾ ಗುರುದಿನೇ ವರಕಾವ್ಯಮೇತದ್ಯಾಶೋಧರೀಯಮಗಮತ್ ಸುಸಮಗ್ರತಾಂ ಚ ||

ಚಾಂಚಲ್ಯ, ವಕ್ರತೆ, ತ್ರೈಕ್ಷಣ್ಯ ಈ ಧರ್ಮಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಣಿಸುವುದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಕವಿ ಸಮಯವಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಆದರಂತೆ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಚಂಚಲವಾದ ವಕ್ರವಾದ ಅಥವಾ ನಿಶಿತವಾದ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುವುದು. ಹಿಂದೆ ಉದಾಹರಿಸಿರುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಈ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಬಗೆಯ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಊಹಿಸಲು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪವಾದರೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ದೊರೆತಂತಾಯಿತು. ಆದರೆ ಆ ಗ್ರಂಥದ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾಕಾರನು ಈ ಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಲಟಪ್ರೇಃ=ಮನೋಹರೈಃ ಎಂಬ (ಧರ್ಮವಾಚಕವಾಗಿ ಗ್ರಹಿಸಿ) ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯಾರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿರುವನು. ಈ ಅರ್ಥವು ಈ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವಬಗೆಯ ವಿರೋಧವೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೊಂದಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಾದರೂ ಹಿಂದೆ ಹೇಳಿದ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗುವಂತೆ ತೋರಿಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಿಂದಣ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಧರ್ಮವಾಚಕವಾಗಿ ಗ್ರಹಿಸಿ ಮನೋಹರತ್ವ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುವುದು. ಆದರೆ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಾದುಸ್ವಚ್ಛಾದಿ ಶಬ್ದಗಳಂತೆ ಈ ಶಬ್ದವೂ ಧರ್ಮಧರ್ಮ್ಯಭಯವಾಚಕವೆಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ಅಧಾರವೂ ಕಂಡುಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಈ ಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿಲಾಸ, ಬೆಡಗು (ಅಥವಾ ತೀವ್ರ) ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಈ ಅರ್ಥವು ಈಗ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳಿಗೂ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿಯೇ ಹೊಂದಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಬಗೆಯ ದೋಷವೂ ಕಂಡುಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಇನ್ನು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಶಬ್ದಗಳ ಅಪಭ್ರಂಶಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳುಳ್ಳ ಪ್ರಾಕೃತಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಯುಕ್ತವಾಗಿರುವ ಈ ಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವರು ಎಂದು ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅತ್ಯಂತ ನಿಕಟವಾಗಿಯೇ ಇರುವುದು. ಪ್ರಾಕೃತನಿಘಂಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸು. ೧೧ ನೆಯ ಶತಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಹೇಮಚಂದ್ರನ ದೇಶೀಯ ನಾಮಮಾಲೆಯು ಒಂದಾಗಿರುವುದು ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ—

ಲಕ್ಷಂ ಕಾವ ಲಗ್ನಂ ಚಿನ್ನೇ ಲಂಚೋಅ ಕುಕ್ಕುಡವ |

ಗಂಡು ಅತಿಣಮ್ನಿ ಲಚಯಂ ಲಟ್ಟಯ ಲಡಹಾ ಕುಸುಮ್ಭರಮ್ಯೇಷು ||

(|| ೧೭ || ವರ್ಗ ೭)

ಲಕ್ಷಂ=ಕಾಯಃ (ದೇಹ). . . . . ಲಡಹಂ=ರಮ್ಯಂ (ಮನೋಹರವಾದುದು.)  
ಲಡಹೋ=ವಿದಗ್ಧ (ಪ್ರೌಢನು) ಇತ್ಯನ್ಯೇ (ಎಂದು ಕೆಲವರು ಹೇಳುವರು.) ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವನು.

ಇದನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿಯೇ—ಅಭಿಧಾನಮಾಲೆಯೆಂಬ ಮಾಗಧಿ ಡಿಕ್ಷನರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ—ಲಟಹ (ಲಟಭ) ಎಂಬ ಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಲಾವಣ್ಯೇ (ಲಾವಣ್ಯದಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ) ಮನೋಜ್ಞೇ (ಮನೋಹರವಾಗಿರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ) ಲಲಿತೇ (ಸುಲಭವಾಗಿರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ) ರಮ್ಯೇ (ಮನೋಹರವಾಗಿರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ) ಎಂದು ಬರೆದು ವಿದಗ್ಧಃ (ಪ್ರೌಢನು)—ಇತ್ಯನ್ಯೇ ಎಂದು ದೇಶೀಯ ನಾಮಮಾಲೆಯನ್ನೇ ಅಧಾರವಾಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವನು.



ಇನ್ನು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಪದಗಳಿಗೆ ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿರುವ ಮಾನ್ಯಮ್ ವಿಲ್ಲಿಯಮ್ (Moniem-Williams) ಡಿಕ್ಷನರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ (ಲಡಹ) ಲಟಿಭ ಶಬ್ದ ಗಳೆರಡನ್ನೂ ಅಭಿನ್ನಗಳಾಗಿ ಗ್ರಹಿಸಿ—handsome girl (ಸುಂದರಿಯಾದ ಹುಡುಗಿ), beautiful woman (ಸುಂದರಿಯಾದ ಹೆಂಗಸು) ಲಟಿಭ (ಲಟಹ) handsome (ಸುಂದರ-ಪುಷ್ಕಳ) pretty, (ಮನೋಹರ) lovely (ಸುಂದರ) ಎಂದೂ, ಲಡಹ=pleasing (ಇಂಪಾದ ಅಥವಾ ಮನೋಹರವಾದ) ಎಂದೂ ಅರ್ಥಬರೆದಿರುವನು. “ಆಪ್ಟೆ (Apte) ಎಂಬವನು ಲಟಿಭ (connected with the prākṛita ಲಡಹ) ಎಂದು ಬರೆದು charming (ರಮಣೀಯ) attractive, (ಆಕರ್ಷಕ) ಎಂದೂ ಅರ್ಥಬರೆದಿರುವನು. ಈ ಮೂವರು ಡಿಕ್ಷನರಿಕಾರರೂ ದೇಶೀಯನಾಮಮಾಲೆಯನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ ಅರ್ಥಬರೆದಿರುವರು. ಇವರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಧರ್ಮಿವಾಚಕವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವರಲ್ಲದೆ ಧರ್ಮವಾಚಕವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲವಾದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಡಿಕ್ಷನರಿಗಳು ಈ ಶಬ್ದಾರ್ಥನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪವೂ ಒತ್ತಾಸೆ ಮಾಡುವಂತಿಲ್ಲ.

ಇದು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಶಬ್ದವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ 1 ವ್ಯುತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯುಂಟೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ? ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದು ಕರ್ತವ್ಯಶೇಷವಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಭಾಷೆಯ ವ್ಯಾಕರಣಿಕತ್ವವಾದ ಪಾಣಿನ್ಯಾಚಾರ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಧಾತು ಪಾಠದಲ್ಲಿ ಲಟಿ ಬಾಲಭಾವೇ, ಲಟಿಪ್ರಮಾದವಚನೇ ದೇವೇಚ ಎಂಬ ಟಿಕಾರಘಟಿತವಾದ ಎರಡು ಧಾತುಗಳು ಕಂಡುಬರುವುದಲ್ಲದೆ ಈ ಧಾತುವಿನಿಂದ ಹುಟ್ಟಿ ಕಪ್ರತ್ಯಯವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ದುರ್ಜನನೆಂದು ಅರ್ಥವುಳ್ಳ 2 ಲಟಿಕಶಬ್ದವೂ (ಉಣಾದಿನ್ವಿಪ್ಪನ್ನ) ಉಪಲಬ್ಧವಾಗುವುದು (ವಾಚಸ್ಪತ್ಯನಿಘಂಟು)—ಪ್ರಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸಕ್ತವಾಗಿರುವ ಲಟಿಹಶಬ್ದವು ಈ ಧಾತುಗಳಿಂದ ಹುಟ್ಟಿದುದಾದರೆ ಲಟಿಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಲಟಿಧಾತುವಿನ ಭಾವನಾಮವನ್ನಾಗಿ ಗ್ರಹಿಸಿ ಲಟಿ+ಹಂತೀ=(ಲಟಹಃ) ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಾತುವಿನೊಡನೆ ಉಪಪದಸಮಾಸವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುವುದು. ಆಗ ಈ ಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಾಲಭಾವವನ್ನು ಹಾಳುಮಾಡುವುದು. ಎಂದರೆ ಯಾವನ ಎಂದಾಗಲಿ, ಪ್ರಮಾದವಚನವನ್ನು ಹಾಳುಮಾಡುವುದು ಎಂದರೆ ಪ್ರೌಢವಚನವನ್ನಾಡುವುದು ಅಥವಾ ದೋಷವನ್ನು ಹಾಳುಮಾಡುವುದು ನಿರ್ದುಷ್ಟವಾದುದು, ಎಂದಾಗಲಿ ಅರ್ಥಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುವುದು. ಈ ಅರ್ಥಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೊಂದೂ ಪ್ರಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೇಲೆಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಲಟಿಹಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗು

1. ವ್ಯುತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯೆಂದರೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲೂ ವ್ಯವಹಾರದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ನಾಮಪದಗಳೆಲ್ಲವೂ ಆಯಾ ಭಾಷೆಗಳ ಯಾವುದಾದರೊಂದು ಮೂಲಧಾತುವಿನಿಂದ ಕೆಲವು ಪ್ರತ್ಯಯಗಳನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ಹುಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು ಎಂದು ನಿರೂಪಿಸುವ ಕ್ರಮ.

2. “ಲಟಿಕಮೇಲಕಪ್ರಹಸನಂ” ಎಂಬ ರೂಪಕವೊಂದು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ರಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಮುದ್ರಿತವಾಗಿದೆ.

ವೃದ್ಧಿ. ಈ ಲಟಧಾತುವಿನಂತೆಯೇ ಲಡ ಎಂಬ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಧಾತುವೂ ಧಾತುಸಾರ ದಲ್ಲಿರುವುದು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಲಡವಿಲಾಸೇ, -ಲಡ ಉತ್ಪೀಡನೇ-ಜಿಹ್ವಾಚಾಲನೇ-ಲಡವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಾ ಲಡಭಾಷಣೇ,-ಲಡಉತ್ಪೇಷಣೇ ಎಂದು ಹಲವರ್ಥಗಳಿರುವುವು. ಇವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಲಡವಿಲಾಸೇ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವುಳ್ಳ ಧಾತುವಿನಿಂದ (ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಲಡಹಶಬ್ದವೆಂದು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಿ) ಲಡಹ ಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ನಿಷ್ಪತ್ತಿಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಲಡಂ+ಹನ್ನೀತಿ= ಲಡಹಂ ಎಂದಾಗುವುದು. ಹೀಗಾದರೂ ವಿಲಾಸವನ್ನು ನಾಶಮಾಡುವುದು ಎಂಬ ವಿರೋಧಾರ್ಥವೇ ಬಂದಂತಾಯಿತಲ್ಲದೆ ಪ್ರಕೃತಕ್ಕೆ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾದ ವಿಲಾಸ ಎಂಬ ಅರ್ಥವು ಲಭಿಸಿದಂತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಹನ್ ಧಾತುವಿಗೆ ಹಿಂಸೆ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವು ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಗತಿಯೆಂಬ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಅರ್ಥವೂ ಉಂಟು. ಈ ಅರ್ಥವು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ 1 ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂಡುಬರದಿದ್ದರೂ ಪ್ರಕೃತ ದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಆ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸುವುದಾದರೆ ವಿಲಾಸವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದಿರುವುದು ಎಂಬ ಧರ್ಮಿವಾಚಕವಾದ ಅರ್ಥವು ಲಭಿಸಿದಂತಾಯಿತು. ಈ ಧರ್ಮಿವಾಚಕಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಕವಿಗಳು ಧರ್ಮವಾಚಕವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವರು ಎಂದೂ ಲಟ, ಲಡ ಇವೆ ರಡು ಧಾತುಗಳಿಗೂ ಅಭೇದವನ್ನು ಗ್ರಹಿಸುವುದರಿಂದ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದದ ವ್ಯುತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯನ್ನೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರೂಪಿಸಿದಂತಾಯಿತು.

ಮೇಲಣವಿಮರ್ಶೆಯಿಂದ ಲಟಹ (ಲಡಹ) ಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿಲಾಸ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವಬಗೆಯ ದೋಷವೂ ಕಂಡುಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಈ ಅರ್ಥವು ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹೊಂದಿಕೆಯಾಗಿಯೂ ಇರುವುದು. ಆದಿಸಂಪನು ಈ ಲಟಹಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ತನ್ನ ಮತ್ತೊಂದುಗ್ರಂಥವಾದ ವಿಕ್ರಮಾರ್ಜುನವಿಜಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಮಾಡದಿರಲು ಕಾರಣವೇನೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಯಲು ಶಕ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಮೇಲಿನ ಅರ್ಥವೇ ಮುಂದಣ ಕನ್ನಡಕವಿಗಳ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿರುವುದು.

ನೇಮಿಚಂದ್ರನು ತನ್ನ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಗ್ರಂಥವಾದ ಲೀಲಾವತಿಯ ಆಶ್ವಾ. ೧೧ ರಲ್ಲಿ-

ಮ||ಸ್ರ|| ಸ್ಫುರಿತ ಸ್ಥೀತಾಧರ ಭ್ರೂಲಟಹಲಲಿತಭಾಳಸ್ಥಳಂ ಭ್ರಾಂತತಾರೋ |

ದರ ದೂರಸ್ಥಾರ ವೇತ್ಸಸ್ವಲಿತಕಳರವೋದಾರಮುತ್ತಾನ ನೃತ್ಯ ||

ತ್ಕರಶಾಖಂ ಕಂಪಮಾನಸ್ತನಮತಿವಿಶದಸ್ವೇದಿ ವಕ್ತ್ರಂ ರತಾಂತಾ |

ತುರ ಸಂರಂಭೋಪಮಂ ಶೋಭಿಸಿದುದು ಸಕಳಸ್ತ್ರೀಸಭಾಕ್ಷೋಭಮಾಗಳಾ ||

ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಭ್ರೂಲಟಹ ಎಂಬ ಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಹುಬ್ಬಿನ ವಿಲಾಸ (ಜರ್ವ) ಎಂಬರ್ಥವು ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿರುವುದು. •

1. ಪದ್ಧತಿ: (ದಾರಿ)=ಎಂಬಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಅರ್ಥವಿರುವಂತೆ ತೋರುವುದು. ಇದನ್ನು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಾ ಲಿಂಕಾಂಕರು ಹೇಳಿರುವರು. ಆದರೆ ಪದ್ಧತಿಂ ಹನ್ನತೇ ತಾಡ್ಯತೇ (ಹೊಡೆಯಲ್ಪಡುವುದು) ಎಂದೂ ಕೆಲವರು ವ್ಯುತ್ಪತ್ತಿಮಾಡಿರುವರು.

ಅನಂತನಾಥ ಪುರಾಣ ಅ. ೫. ೫೩ರ ಗದ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ—

ವ|| ಮಂಗಳಾಚಾರ ಚಾರುಸಂಗೀತಕವಾರಣೋದೀರಿತ ಮಂಗಲ್ಯಪಟುಲಟಹ ಪಟಹಪ್ರಧ್ವಾನಮೆಸೆಯೆ—ಎರಿಬ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಲಾಸ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವು ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೂ ಪ್ರಾಕೃತಶಬ್ದದ ಅರ್ಥದಂತೆ ವಿದಗ್ಧ = ಪ್ರೌಢ ಅಥವಾ ಮನೋಹರ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಿ ಪ್ರೌಢವಾದ ಎಂದರೆ ಪ್ರಬಲವಾದ ಪಟಹಧ್ವನಿ ಎಂಬ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು.

೬. ಮೂರಿ.

ಈ ಶಬ್ದವು ಪಂಪಕವಿಕೃತವಾದ ವಿಕ್ರಮಾರ್ಜುನವಿಜಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಲವೆಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಪದದೊಡನೆ ಸಮಾಸವಡೆದು “ಮೂರಿವಿಡು” ಎಂದು ಪ್ರಯುಕ್ತವಾಗಿದೆ.

(1) ಆಗಳ್ ದುರ್ಯೋಧನನಂ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟೊಡಗೊಂಡು ಧೃತರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಕರ್ಣ ಶಲ್ಯ ಶಕುನಿ ಸೈಂಧವ ಪ್ರಭೃತಿಗಳ್ ನೆಲಂ ಮೂರಿವಿಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಸಭಾಕ್ಷೋಭವಾಗೆ ತಳದುಫ .....ನಿಜನಿವಾಸಂಗಳ್ಗೆ ಪೋದರ್. (ಅ. ೨-೮೬ ವ)

(2) ಆಗಳ್ ದ್ರುಪದಂ ಬದ್ಧವಣದ ಪಱಿಗಳಂ ಬಾಜಿಸಲ್ವೆಟ್ಟು .....ತನ್ನ ಮಗಂದಿರುಂ ತಮ್ಮಂದಿರುಂ ಬೆರಸು ನೆಲಂ ಮೂರಿವಿಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಬರೆ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟು ಪೊಟಿ ಲೊಡಗೊಂಡುವರ್ಪುದುಂ—(ಅ. ೩-೬೪ ವ||)

(3) ಇತ್ತ ಪುರುಷೋತ್ತಮನುಂ ಕತಿಪಯಪ್ರಯಾಣಂಗಳಿಂ ವಿರಾಟಪುರನಿಕಟ ವರ್ತಿಯಪ್ಪ ದಿವಿಜಾಪಗಾತಟದುಪವನದೊಳರಿನ್ನ ಪವನಕ್ಕುಪದ್ರವಕಾರಿಯಾಗಿ ನೆಲಂ ಮೂರಿವಿಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಜಾತಶತ್ರುವನವನತೋತ್ತಮಾಂಗನಾಗಿ ಕಂಡು—

(ಅ. ೯-೮೭ ಪ)

(4) ಕುರುಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದ ಪೂರ್ವದಿಶಾಭಾಗದೊಳ್ ಪ್ರಳಯಂ ಮೂರಿವಿಟ್ಟಂತೆ—

(ಅ. ೧೦. ೩೧. ವ||)

ಮೇಲಣ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದನೆಯ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೈಂಧವಪ್ರಭೃತಿಗಳು ನೆಲವು ಮೂರಿವಿಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಸಭಾಕ್ಷೋಭವಾಗಲು ತಳದುಫರು ಎಂದು ಅನ್ವಯವಾಗುವುದಾದರೂ ಮೂರಿವಿಡು ಎಂಬ ಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಷ್ಕೃಷ್ಟವಾದ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಎರಡನೆಯ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗ ದ್ರುಪದನು ಮಂಗಳವಾದ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಬಾಜಿಸಹೇಳಿ ತನ್ನ ತಮ್ಮಂದಿರು ಮಕ್ಕಳುಗಳೊಡನೆ ನೆಲವು ಮೂರಿವಿಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಬಂದನು ಎಂದು ಈ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೇಲಣಪ್ರಯೋಗಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಯಾವ ವಿಶೇಷವೂ ತೋರಿಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೂರನೆಯ ಮತ್ತು ನಾಲ್ಕನೆಯ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳೂ ಇವೆರಡರಂತೆಯೇ ಯಾವಳಿಯ ವಿಶೇಷಾರ್ಥವನ್ನೂ ಸೂಚಿಸುವ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳೆಲ್ಲವೂ “ನೆಲಂ ಬಿಸುತೆ ಯಾದಂತೆ” ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿರುವುದರಿಂದ—

(1) ನ|| ಅಂತಾಗಸಮಾಂದಂತೆಯುಮೆಳೆ ಬೆಸಲಾದಂತೆಯುಂ ಮುನ್ನೀರ್  
ಮೇರೆವಂದಂತೆಯುಂ ನಡೆದು ಭಂಡಣದೆಡೆಯೊಳ್ ತಂಡತಂಡದಿಂದೆಡ್ಡ ಮುಪ್ಪಂತೊಡ್ಡಿ  
ನಿಲಲೊಡನೆ- ಕಬ್ಬಿಗರ ಕಾವ ೨೫೫ ರ ವಚನ-

(2) ಗಗನಂ ಕವಿದಂತೆ ದೆಸೆಗಳುಗುಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಭೂಮಿ ಬೆಸಲಾದಂತೆ, ಭೂಚಕ್ರಮಂ  
ತೆಕ್ಕನೆ ತೀವಿದ ಪದಾತಿಬಲದೊಳಂ- (ಗಿರಿಜಾಕಲ್ಯಾಣ ಆ. ೬. ಪ. ೫೫.)

(3) ನೆಲಂ ಬೆಸಲೆಯಾದವೋಲ್ ನೆರೆದೆ ಲುಬ್ಧಕವ್ಯಾಹಮಂ |  
ಗೆಲಲ್ ನೆಜೆದೇನೀಗಲೆಂಬ ಬಲಗರ್ವಮಂತಾಳ್ವಿದಂ ||  
(ಸಂ. ರಾ. ಆ. ೪. ಪ. ೫೫.)

(4) ಕಡೆಗೆ ಹಾಯ್ದು ವು ಕಂಗಳೇಬಲ, ಗಡಲ ಮನವೀಸಾಡಲಾರದಿ |  
ದೊಡಲುಸಿಡಿದಿರದಿನ್ನು ಕಾಣಲುಬಾರದದ್ಭುತವ ||  
ಪೊಡವಿ ಯಾನ್ದು ದೊ ಮೋಹರವನಿದ, ರೊಡನೆ ಕಾದುವನಾವನಾತನೆ |  
ಮೃಡನು ಶಿವ! ಶಿವ! ಕಾದಿ ಗೆಲಿದೆವು ಬಲಕೆ ನಮೊ ಯೆಂದ ||  
ಗದುಗಿನ ಭಾರತ-ವಿರಾಟಪರ್ವ-

(5) .....ವರವಿಲಾಸದಾರಥಹಯಂಗಳ ಚಾತುರಂಗಬಲ |  
ವೀಶಭಕ್ತರ ಪೆಂಪಿನಿಂ ಭಾವು! ಕೂಡಿತ್ತು ಭೂಮಿ ಬೆಸಲಾದಂದದಿಂ || ೨ ||  
ಭಾವಚಿಂತಾರತ್ನ (ಆ. ೮. ಪ. ೨.)-

ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳ ತಾತ್ಪರ್ಯವನ್ನನುಸರಿಸಿ ಈ ಮೂರಿವಿಡು ಎಂಬ ಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೂ  
ಬೆಸಲೆಯಾಗು ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದೆಂದು ತೋರುವುದು. ಬೆಸಲೆಯಾಗು ಎಂಬ  
ಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಜಗನ್ನಾಥವಿಜಯದ ಈ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಿಂದ (ಅಂತು ನವಮಾಸಂ ತೀವಿ ದೇವಕಿ  
ಬೆಸಲೆಯಪ್ಪುದುಂ) ಪ್ರಸವಿಸು ಎಂದು ನಿಷ್ಕೃಷ್ಟವಾದ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ  
ಮೂರಿವಿಡುಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೂ ಪ್ರಸವಿಸು ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ ಸೈನ್ಯವು ನೆಲವೇ ಪ್ರಸವಿಸಿದಂತೆ  
ಎಂದರೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಅಪಾರವಾಗಿ ಅಥವಾ ಅಸಂಖ್ಯಾತವಾಗಿ ಬಂದುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದಾ  
ದುದರಿಂದ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯಪರಿಷತ್ಪಂಡಿತರು ಪರಿಷತ್ತಿನಿಂದ ಮುದ್ರಿತವಾಗಿರುವ (1931 ರಲ್ಲಿ)  
ಪಂಪಭಾರತದ ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಕ್ಲಿಷ್ಟಪದಾರ್ಥಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರಿವಿಡು=  
ಪ್ರಸವಿಸು ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥ ಬರೆದು ಅದೂ ತೃಪ್ತಿ ಕರವಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನಾರ್ಥಕಚಿಹ್ನವನ್ನು  
ಹಾಕಿ ಸಂದೇಹವನ್ನೇ ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವರು.

ಈ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯಪರಿಷತ್ಪಂಡಿತರೇ ಈ ಗ್ರಂಥಕ್ಕೆ ಮೊದಲೇ ಮುದ್ರಿತವಾಗಿರುವ (1921  
ರಲ್ಲಿ) ಪಂಪರಾಮಾಯಣದ-

ಉ|| “ ನಾಡರಸಂ ತಗುಳ್ಳ ಕಡೆಗಾಲದ ಮಾರಿಯ ಮೂರಿಯಂತೆ ಕ |  
 ಕೋಡದೆ ಬಾಲವೃದ್ಧ ವನಿತಾವಧಿಗೆಯ್ದು ಕವರ್ತೆಗೊಂಡು ಸು ||  
 ಬೋಡಿಸಿ ಜಾತಿಯೆಂ ಕಿಡಿಸಿ ನಾಡರಸಂ ಕಡಿಕ್ಕಿ ಮೆಚ್ಚಿದಂ |  
 ಬೇಡರಸಂ ತರಂಗತಮನಾನಿರೆ ಬೇಡರಸೆಂಬ ಗರ್ವದಿಂ || (ಆ. ಲ. ಪ. ೩೮.)

ಎಂಬ ಪದ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಮೂರಿಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಗ್ರಂಥದ ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಕ್ಲಿಷ್ಟ ಪದಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರಿ = ಬಳಗ ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವರು. ಆದರೆ ಆಶ್ವಾಸ ಹದಿಮೂರರಲ್ಲಿ ದೊರಕುವ—(ಪ. ೧೧೯.)—

ಮಿಳಿದು ಮಿಳಿಸೆ ಪಾನರಕೇತನಂ | ಪ್ರಳಯಕಾಲದ ಮಾರಿಯ ಮೂರಿಯಂ ||  
 ತಳೆದು ಮಾರುತಿಯೇಱಾದ ತೇರದೇಂ | ತಳದುರ್ದೋ ಧರೆ ಕಂಪಿಸುವನ್ನೆಗಂ ||

ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಮೂರಿಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ಗಮನಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲವೋ ತಿಳಿಯದು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಬಳಗ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವು ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಲಾರದುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟಿರಬಹುದು ಎಂಬ ಶಂಕೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಸಂಪಭಾರತದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನಾರ್ಥಕ ಚಿಹ್ನೆವು ಮಾತ್ರ ಸಂಪರಾಮಾಯಣದಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲವಾದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪಂಡಿತರಿಗೆ ಬಳಗ ಎಂಬ ಧ್ವನಿ ಇಷ್ಟವೆಂದು ತೋರಿಬರುವುದು. ಪ್ರಾಯಶಃ ಈ ಅರ್ಥಭ್ರಾಂತಿಗೆ ಹರಿಹರನ ಗಿರಿಜಾಕಲ್ಯಾಣದ ಪ್ರಯೋಗವೊಂದು ಸಾಹ್ಯವಾಗಿರುವುದೆಂದು ಊಹಿಸಲವಕಾಶ ವುಂಟು. ಹರಿಹರನಿಂದ ರಚಿತವಾದ ಗಿರಿಜಾಕಲ್ಯಾಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ. ೬. ೫೫ ರ ವಚನದಲ್ಲಿ—

‘ ಪೆರ್ಬುಲಿಯೊರ್ಬುಳಿಯಂತೆ ಸಿಂಗದ ವಂಗಡದಂತೆ ಶರಭಂಗಳ ನೆರವಿಯಂತೆ,  
 ಭೇರುಂಡನ ಹಿಂಡಿನಂತೆ, ಕುಳಿಕನ ಕುಳದಂತೆ, ಸಿಡಿಲ ಗಡಣದಂತೆ, ಕಾಲ್ಕಿಚ್ಚಿನ ಗೂಳಿಯ  
 ದಂತೆ, ಮಾರಿಯ ಮೂರಿಯಂತೆ ಭೈರವನ ಬಳಗದಂತೆ ಮುಂತಿದ್ದ ರಕ್ತ ಸವಡೆಯ ನಡುವೆ  
 ನಿಂದಿದ್ದ ವೀರತಾರಕಾ ಸುರಂ ” ಎಂಬ ಗದ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಮೂಹಾರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವ ಪದಗಳ  
 ಉಳ್ಳ ವಾಕ್ಯಗಳ ಸಾನ್ನಿಧ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾರಿಯ ಮೂರಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮೂರಿ  
 ಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಳಗ ಎಂಬರ್ಥ ವಿರಬಹುದೆಂಬ ಭ್ರಾಂತಿಹುಟ್ಟಬಹುದು.

ಈ ಅರ್ಥಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಸಾರಿಯಾಗಿ ಮೂರಿವಿಡು ಎಂಬಲ್ಲಿ ಗುಂಪಾಗಿ (ಬಳಗವಾಗಿ) ಬಿಡು ಅಥವಾ ಅಗು ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದು.

ಪ್ರಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಪನ ಗ್ರಂಥವೊಂದರ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಿಂದಲೂ, ಸಂಪರಾಮಾಯಣದ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಿಂದಲೂ ಈ ಮೂರಿಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಷ್ಕೃಷ್ಟವಾದ ಅರ್ಥವು ಪ್ರಕರಣಬಲದಿಂದ ದೊರಕದಿರುವಾಗ ಮತ್ತಿನ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕಮಹಾಕವಿಗಳ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳನ್ನು ಆರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅವುಗಳಿಂದಲಾದರೂ ಪ್ರಕರಣಾದಿಗಳ ಒತ್ತಾಸೆಯಿಂದ ನಿಷ್ಕೃಷ್ಟಾರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಯತ್ನಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದು.

(ಜನ್ನಮಹಾಕವಿಯು (1235) ತನ್ನಿಂದ ರಚಿತವಾದ ಯಶೋಧರಚರಿತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ-)  
ಭೈರವನ ಜವನ ಮಾರಿಯು | ಮೂರಿಯನೋಲ್ ನಿಂದ ಮಾರಿದತ್ತಂ ಲಲಿತಾ ||  
ಕಾರರ ಧೀರರ ಬಂದ ಕು | ಮಾರರ ರೂಪಿಗೆ ರಕ್ಕುಗೊಂಡಂತಿದಂ || ೫೮ ||

(ಅನತಾ. ೧.)

ಮಾರಿಯಮೂರಿಯನೋಲ್ ನಿಂದಿದಂ ಮಾರಿದತ್ತಂ ಎಂದು ಮೂರಿಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವನು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಆ ಗ್ರಂಥಸಂಪಾದಕರು ಮೂರಿ=ಕೋಪ ಎಂದು ರೇಖೆಯ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಟಿಪ್ಪಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದಿರುವರು. ಹಿಂದೆ ಮೂರಿ ಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಸಲೆಯಾಗು ಎಂಬ ಶಬ್ದದ ಅಧಾರದಿಂದ ಪ್ರಸವಿಸು ಅಥವಾ ಬಳಗ ಎಂಬ ಪರಿಷತ್ತಿನ ಊಹಾವಿಷಯವಾಗಿರುವ ಅರ್ಥಗಳು (ಎಂದರೆ ಮಾರಿಯು ಪ್ರಸವಿಸಿದಂತೆ ನಿಂದ ಎಂದಾಗಲಿ ಮಾರಿಯ ಜಳಗದಂತೆ ನಿಂದ ಎಂದಾಗಲಿ ಹೇಳುವ ಅರ್ಥಗಳು) ಮಾರಿಯ ಮೂರಿಯನೋಲ್ ನಿಂದ ಎಂಬೀ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪವೂ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರಿಯೆಂಬುದು ಒಂದು ವಸ್ತುವಾಚಕವಾಗಿಯೂ ಇರುವುದು. ಆದರೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಮೂರಿವಿಡು ಎಂಬ ಸಮಾಸಪದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಸವಿಸು ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದೆಯಲ್ಲದೆ ಮೂರಿಯೆಂಬ ವ್ಯುತ್ಪದಕ್ಕೆ ಆ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಮೂರಿಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂತಾನ (ಮೂರಿವಿಡು-ಸಂತಾನವನ್ನು ಹೊರ ಗೆಡ್ಡೆ=ಪ್ರಸವಿಸು) ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ ಮೂರಿವಿಡು ಎಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಸವಿಸು ಎಂಬ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದಾದುದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರಕೃತ ಯಶೋಧರಚರಿತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾರಿಯಸಂತಾನ ದಂತೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಮಗನಂತೆ ನಿಂತಿರುವ ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥಹೇಳುವುದು ಮತ್ತಾವ ಸಮಂಜಸ ವಾದ ಅರ್ಥವು ತೋರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೊದಲು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿ ತೋರಿಬಂದರೂ ಸಂಪಾದಕರ ಟಿಪ್ಪಣಿಯಂತೆ ಕೋಪ ಎಂಬ ಅರ್ಥವು ಮೂರಿ ಎಂಬೀ ಶಬ್ದದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂದಿಗೂ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಪ್ರಸವಿಸು ಎಂಬರ್ಥದ ತಾತ್ಪರ್ಯದಿಂದ ಮೂರಿ ಎಂಬುದು ಮೂರ್ತಿ=(ಆಕಾರ) ಎಂಬ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಶಬ್ದದ ತದ್ಭವರೂಪವೆಂದು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿ ಕೆಲವರು ಸಂತಾನ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನೇ ಪುಷ್ಟೀಕರಿಸಲೂ ಆರಂಭಿಸಿರುವರು.

ಮೇಲಣಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಿಂದ ಪ್ರಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರಿಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಕಾರ ಅಥವಾ ಸಂತಾನ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನೂ ಮೂರಿವಿಡು ಎಂಬ ಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಸವಿಸು ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನೂ ಊಹಿಸಬಹುದು ದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಂತಾಯಿತು. ಈ ಅರ್ಥವು ಮತ್ತಿನ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಮಹಾಕವಿಗಳ ಪ್ರಯೋ ಗಗಳಿಗೂ ಹೊಂದಿಕೆಯಾಗುವುದೇ? ಇಲ್ಲವೇ? ಎಂಬ ವಿಚಾರವು ಪ್ರಾಸಂಗಿಕವಾಗಿರು ವುದು.

ಕಂ|| ಸಿಡಿಲ ಬಳಗಕ್ಕೆ ಕುಳಿಕನ |

ಕುಡುದಾಡೆಗೆ ಮೂರಿ(ಃ) ವಿಟ್ಟ ಮಾರಿಗೆ ಮಾಱಾಂ ||

ಪೊಡವಣ್ಣ ಜವನ ಬಡಿಗಂ |

ಕಡುಗಲಿ ಹಬ್ಬಣನ ಬಿಲ್ಲನಾಂಪವನಾಂ || ಕೊಲ್ಲಾ ಪುರದ ಶಾಸನ ೩೫ ||

ಉ|| ಮಾರಿಯ ಮೂರಿ ರಕ್ಕಸನ ರೌದ್ರತೆ ನಂಜಿನ ಪುಂಜಮುಗ್ರಕಂ |  
 ರೀರವದೆತ್ತರಂ ಸಿಡಿಲ ಕಾಯ್ವು ಕೃತಾಂತನ ಕೋಪದುರ್ವ ಮಾ ||  
 ರಾರಿಯ ಭಾಳನೇತ್ರಶಿಖಿ ಸಂಗರರಂಗದೊಳಾಂತು ನಿಂದ ವೀ |  
 ರಾರಿಗೆ ಸಂತತಂ ನೆಗಟ್ಟಿ ಸಾಹಣಿಮಲ್ಲನ ಬಾಹುವಿಕ್ರಮಂ || ೧೪ ||  
 (ಕೊಲ್ಲಾಪುರದ ಶಾಸನ )

ಮೇಲೆಹೇಳಿದ ಎರಡು ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಸಹಚರಿತವಾಕ್ಯಗಳ ಅಧಾರದಿಂದಲೂ ಈ ಶಬ್ದದ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ನಿಷ್ಕೃಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಲು ಶಕ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಪದ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಡುಗಲಿಯಾದ ಹಬ್ಬಣನಿಗೆ ಉಪಮಾನವಾಗಿ (ನಿದರ್ಶನವಾಗಿ) ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಸಿಡಿಲಿಗೆ 'ಸಿಡಿಲಬಳಗ' ಎಂದರೆ ಸಿಡಿಲಸಮೂಹವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಎರಡನೆಯ ಉಪಮಾನವಾದ ಕುಳಿಕನಿಗೆ ಕುಳಿಕನ ಕುಡುಡಾಡೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಕುಳಿಕನ ವಕ್ರವಾದ ಕೋರಿಹಲ್ಲೆಂದು ಕುಳಿಕನ ಅವಯವವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಈ ಮೂರನೆಯ ಮೂರಿವಿಟ್ಟಮಾರಿಗೆ ಎಂಬಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರಿಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಳಗವೆಂದಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮಾರಿಯ ಯಾವುದಾದರೊಂದು ಅವಯವವೆಂದಾಗಲಿ ಹೇಳಬಹುದಲ್ಲದೆ ನಿಷ್ಕೃಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಇದೇ ಅರ್ಥವೆಂದು ಏರ್ಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮುಂದಣಿ ೨ ನೆಯ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಮಾರಿಯಮೂರಿ, ರಕ್ಕಸನ ರೌದ್ರತೆ, ನಂಜಿನಪುಂಜ, ಉಗ್ರಕಂಠೀರವದೆತ್ತರಂ ಎಂದು ಶೂರನಾದ ಸಾಹಣಿಮಲ್ಲನ ಪರಾಕ್ರಮಕ್ಕೆ ಉಪಮಾನವಾಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ರಾಕ್ಷಸನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ರೌದ್ರತೆ ಎಂಬ ಗುಣವನ್ನೂ ನಂಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪುಂಜ, ಎಂದರೆ ಸಮೂಹ ಎಂಬ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನೂ ಕಂಠೀರವದಲ್ಲಿ ಎತ್ತಿರ ಎಂಬ ಗುಣವನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಸಿಡಿಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಯ್ವು ಎಂಬ ಗುಣವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ ಯಮನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೋಪದ ಉರ್ಬಿಂಬ ಧರ್ಮವನ್ನೂ ಈಶ್ವರನಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಂಕಿಯೆಂಬ ದ್ರವ್ಯವನ್ನುಳ್ಳ ಹಣೆಗಣ್ಣೆಂಬ ಅವಯವವನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂಕೂಡ ಸಹಚರಿತಗಳಾಗಿರುವ ಪದಗಳ ಅಧಾರದಿಂದ ಮಾರಿಯಮೂರಿ ಎಂಬಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರಿಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾರಿಯ ಯಾವುದಾದರೊಂದು ಗುಣ (ಕೋಪ, ರೌದ್ರತೆ, ಮೊದಲಾದುವಂತೆ) ವೆಂದು ಅರ್ಥ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೋ ಅಥವಾ ಗುಂಪೆಂಬ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕೋ ಅಥವಾ ಅವಯವ ಎಂಬ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕೋ ಯಾವುದೂ ನಿಶ್ಚಿತವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅರ್ಥನೇಮಿಪುರಾಣ (ನೇಮಿನಾಥಪುರಾಣ) ಲೀಲಾವತೀಕಾವ್ಯಗಳ ಕರ್ತೃವಾದ ನೇಮಿಚಂದ್ರನು ಲೀಲಾವತಿಯೆಂಬ ಕಾವ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ. ೨ ರಲ್ಲಿ—

ಉ|| ಮತ್ತೆ ಬೊಜಂಗರಿಲ್ಲ ಪೊಣಗೊಚ್ಚತವೇಂ ನಿನಗುಂಟು ಕೊಳ್ಳ ಚಿ |  
 ಕ್ಕೊತ್ತಿಗೆ ಪೊಕ್ಕೆಯಂತು ಸುನಿಯಂತಿರೆ ನಿಲ್ವಳಿ-ಸೂಜಿ ಕೇಳರೋ ||  
 ಒತ್ತಿಗೆ ನಾಣ್ಣಿಯುಂ ಪೊಣಮಡಾಂ ಮೊಣಿಯಿಟ್ಟಪೆನೆಂದು ಸುತ್ತಿದಳಾ |  
 ಕುತ್ತಿದಳೆಚ್ಚಿ ಚೌಕಿಗೆಯನೊರ್ಬಳಿ ಮಾರಿಯಮೂರಿಯಂದದಿಂ || ೧೨೨ ||

ಈ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಮೂರಿಶಬ್ದದ ನಿಷ್ಕೃಷ್ಟಾರ್ಥವು ಧೊರಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಉಹಿಸಿರುವ ಅಕಾರ ಎಂಬರ್ಥಕ್ಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ವಿರೋಧವೇನೂ ಕಂಡುಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಈ ನೇಮಿಚಂದ್ರನೇ ತನ್ನ ಅರ್ಧನೇಮಿಪುರಾಣದ ಆಶ್ವಾಸ ೩ ರಲ್ಲಿ—

ಕಂ|| ತಾರಗೆಯೆನೆ ತೊನೆದೊಟ್ಟಿದ |  
ಮೂರಿಯ ರೋಮಂಥಫೇನಮಜರಿನಿಕರಂ ||  
ಕಾರಿರುಳ ತಿರುಳಿದೆನೆ ಮದ |  
ಸ್ಥಿರಿಭಮಿಪುರವು ಚಳತ್ತಮಾಳದ ನೆಲಲೊಳ್ || ೪೫ || (ಆ. ೩)

ಎಂದು ಮೂರಿಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವನು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ “ಗಾಳಿಗೆ ಎಲೆಗಳಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಹೊಂಗೆಯ ತೋಪಿನ ನೆಳಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾರಿರುಳ ತಿರುಳೋ” ಎಂಬಂತೆ ಕಪ್ಪನೆಯ ಮದಿಸಿದ ಕೋಣಗಳು ಮಲಗಿ ಮೆಲುಕುಹಾಕುತ್ತಿದ್ದುವು. ಆ ಕೋಣಗಳು ಮೆಲುಕುಹಾಕುವಾಗ ಒಂದರನೇಲೊಂದರಂತೆ ಒಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಮೂರಿಯ ಎಂದರೆ ಕಡೆವಾಯಿಂದ ಹೊರಚಿಲ್ಲಿದ (ಎಂಬರ್ಥವು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿರುವುದು) ನೊರೆಯ ಗೊಂಚಲಿನ ಸಮೂಹವು ನಕ್ಷತ್ರದಂ (ರಾಶಿಯ) ತೆ ತೋರುತ್ತಿದ್ದುವು. ಪ್ರಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೋಣಗಳ ಮೆಲುಕಿನ ನೊರೆಯ ರಾಶಿಯು ಕಡೆವಾಯಿಂದ ಬೀಳುವುದಾದುದರಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರಿಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಡೆವಾಯಿ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವಲ್ಲದೆ ಮತ್ತಾವ ಅರ್ಥವೂ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಇದೇ ಅರ್ಧನೇಮಿಪುರಾಣದ ಆ. ೨ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ. ೮೫—

ಮ|| ಅಡೆವಂ ಗೋಣ್ಣುರಿಗೊಂಡು ಬೋಟದಲೆಯಂ ಮುಂಗೆಯ್ಗಳಂ ಮೂರಿಗೊಂ |  
ಡಿಡುವಂ ಕೂಂಕಿ ಕೊಡಂಕೆಯಂ ಮುರಿವನುಳ್ಳುತ್ತಳ್ಳೆಯಂ ಗಲ್ಲಮಂ ||  
ಮಿಡಿವಂ ಮಿಂಡರ ಮಿಸೆಯಂ ಸೆಲೆದು ಮೂಗಿಟ್ಟೀಲುಂ ಮಕ್ಕಳ |  
ಕ್ರೊಡೆ ಬಾಯ್ಪಾಯನೆ ಪೊಯ್ವನೇಂ ಸಿತಗನೋ ಕಾಳಾಹಿಕೋಳಾಹಳಂ ||

ಈ ಪದ್ಯದಲ್ಲೂ ಬಾಯಿ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವು ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗುವುದು. (ಮುಂಗೆಯ್ಗಳನ್ನು ಬಾಯಿಗೆ ಚಾಚಿ ಹೊಡೆಯುವನು.)

ಜನ್ನ ಮಹಾಕವಿಯ ಅನಂತನಾಥಪುರಾಣದ ಆ. ೧೧ ಪ. ೮೩ ರಲ್ಲಿ—

ಮ|| ನೊಣೆಯಲಾನುಂಗಲಿಳಾತಳಂ ಮುರಿದು ಮೂರಿಟ್ಟಂತೆ ದುರ್ಗಕ್ಕೆ ನಿ |  
ಚ್ಚಣಿ ಸಾಚ್ಚುಂದೊಲೆ ವೀರಸೇತು ನಡೆಸಾರಂ ಬದ್ಧರಂ ಗೆಗ್ಗೆ ಡೆಂ ||  
ಕಣಿ ಗುಮ್ಮಂ ಪಡಗೋಂಟಿ ಯೆಂಬ ಹುಕ್ಕೋಟಾಯಂತ್ರಸಾಮಗ್ರಿ ತಿಂ |  
ತಿಣಿಗೊಂಡಾಂತಿರೆ ಲಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾರ್ದ ವಸುಷೇಣಂ ಸಾರ್ದ ಸೂಚ್ಯಿಸಿದಂ || ೮೩ ||

ಈ ಪದ್ಯದಲ್ಲೂ ಇಳಾತಳಮಂ ನೊಣೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ನುಂಗುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ವಕ್ರವಾಗಿ (ಮುರಿದು) ಬಾಯಿಬಿಟ್ಟಂತೆ (ಮೂರಿವಿಟ್ಟಂತೆ) ಎಂಬರ್ಥವು ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿರುವುದು.



ಆದಕಾರಣ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲಾ ಅರ್ಥನೇಮಿಪುರಾಣದ ಪ್ರಯೋಗವೇ ಮೂರಿಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಾಯಿ ಅಥವಾ (ಕಡೆನಾಯಿ) ಎಂಬ ನಿಷ್ಕೃಷ್ಟವಾದ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಲು ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು. ಈ ಅರ್ಥವೇ ಪ್ರಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗುವುದು. ಮತ್ತು ಶಾಸನದ 1 ಮೂರಿವಿಟ್ಟ ಮಾರಿ ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರಿವಿಡು ಎಂಬ ಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಾಯನ್ನು ಬಿಡು ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥಹೇಳಲು ಮೂರಿಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕಿರುವ ಬಿಡುಶಬ್ದದ ಸಾಹಚರ್ಯವು ಬಾಯಿ ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಲು ಕೊಂಚಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದು.

ಉ|| ಮಾರಿಯಮೂರಿ ಮೇಲೆಹಿಗುವಂದದೆ ಭೋಂಕೆನೆ ಮೇಲೆವಿಲ್ಲ ಕಂ |

ಠೀರವಮಂ ಮಹಾರವಮನಾಕೃತಿಭೈರವಮಂ ಸಮಗ್ರಮ ||

(ವರ್ಧಮಾನಪುರಾಣ. ಅ. ೩. ಪ. ೪೪.)<sup>2</sup>

ಈ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರಿಯಮೂರಿ ಎಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾರಿಯ ಬಾಯಿ ಎಂದರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿರುವುದು.

ರುದ್ರಭಟ್ಟಕೃತವಾದ ಜಗನ್ನಾಥವಿಜಯದ ಅ. ೧೮. ಪ. ೧೩ ರಲ್ಲಿ—

ಮ|| ಜವದಿಂ ಬಂದುದು ದಳೈನುತ್ತುರಿವ ಮೆಯ್ಯುಂ ಧೂಮದುವೆಂಬ ಜ |

ಜುವವುರ್ಬುಂ ಕುಡುದಾಡೆಗಳ್ ಪೊಳೆವಬಾಯುಂ ಕಣ್ಣಿಗುರ್ವಾಗೆ ಮೂ ||

ರಿವಿಡುತ್ತುಂ ತಿರುಗುತ್ತುವಾಗುಲಾಸುತುಂ ರೌದ್ರಜ್ವರಂ ತಪ್ಪಹೇ |

ಮವಿಭೂಷಂ ತ್ರಿಶಿರಂ ತ್ರಿಸಾದವರುಣಾಕ್ಷಂ ರೂಕ್ಷರಕ್ಷಾಯುಧಂ || ೧೩ ||

ಈ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕುಡುದಾಡೆಗಳೂ ಹೊಳೆವ ಬಾಯೂ, ಕಣ್ಣೂ ಭಯಂಕರವಾಗಿರಲು ಮೂರಿವಿಡುತ್ತುಂ ಎಂದರೆ ಬಾಯಿಬಿಡುತ್ತಾ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಆದರೆ ತಮಿಳಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರಿವಿಡು ಎಂಬ ಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿನೈಯಿಂದೇಳುವಾಗ ಮೈಮುರಿವುದು ಎಂಬರ್ಥವು ರೂಢಿಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. (ಮೂರಿನಿಮಿರನ್ದು ಮುಲಂಗಿ ಪುಲಪ್ಪಟ್ಟು (ತಿರುಪ್ಪಾವೈ.) ಅದರಂತೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಮೈಮುರಿಯುತ್ತಾ, ತಿರುಗುತ್ತಾ, ಅಕಳಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಎಂದೂ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು.

ಅಪರಿಮಿತವಾದ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನೆಲಂ ಮೂರಿವಿಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಎಂಬುದರ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವ ನೆಲಂ ಬೆಸಲೆಯಾದಂತೆ ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಿ

1. ಮೇಲಣ ಹಲವು ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾರಿಯ ಮೂರಿ ಎಂದು ಮಾರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮೂರಿ ಎಂದಿರುವುದು. ಈ ಪ್ರಯೋಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಮೂರಿವಿಟ್ಟುಮಾರಿ ಎಂದು ಬಿಡು ಶಬ್ದದೊಡನೆ ಸಮಸ್ತಪದವಾಗಿ ಮೂರಿಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿಶೇಷಣವಾಗಿರುವುದು.

2. ಹಸ್ತಲಿಖಿತಪ್ರತಿ (ಈ ಶಾಖೆಯಿಂದ ಮುದ್ರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದು.)

ರುವಂತೆಯೇ ನೆಲಂ ಬಾಯ್ವಿಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳೂ ಹಲವಿರುವುವು. ಗುಬ್ಬಿಯ ಮಲ್ಲಣಾರ್ಯನು ಭಾವಚಿಂತಾರತ್ನದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ. ೫-೧೮-

ನಾ||ಸ|| ರಾಯನತಿವೈಭವದೊಳರಮನೆಯ ಪುಗಲಿತ್ತು |  
 ಬಾಯತೆಹಿದಿಳಿ ಘೂರ್ವಿಪಂತೆ ನಿಸ್ಸಾಣನಿಕ ||  
 ರಾಯಕೋಟೆಗಳ ಧಾಂಧಳರವಂ ಪೊಣ್ಣೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯ ಚಾತುರಂಗಸೇನೆ |  
 ಈಯವನಿಯಗಲಕ್ಕೆ ಕೆದಹಿ..... ||

ಈ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳ ಪ್ರತಿಸ್ಥಾನೀಯವಾದ ಮೂರಿವಿಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಮೂರಿಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಾಯಿ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವು ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿಯೇ ಇರುವುದು. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಪಂಪರಾಮಾಯಣದ ಮತ್ತು ಯಶೋಧರಚರಿತೆಗಳ ಮಾರಿಯ ಮೂರಿಯಂತೆ ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಮಾರಿಯ ಬಾಯಂತೆ ಭಯಂಕರವಾಗಿರುವ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವು ಉಚಿತವಾಗಿಯೇ ಇರುವುದು. ಹೀಗೆಯೇ ಮೂರಿವಿಟ್ಟಮಾರಿಗೆ ಮಾರಿಯ ಮೂರಿ ಎಂಬ ಶಾಸನಗಳ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಮಾರಿಯಬಾಯಿ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವು ಅಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗೆ ಮೇಲಣ ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲಾ ಮೂರಿಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕ ಬಾಯಿ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವು ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿ ಪೋಷವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಲ್ಲದೆ ಎಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಅಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿಯಾಗಲಿ, ಅಪುಷ್ಕವಾಗಿಯಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಅತ್ಯಪ್ಪಿಕರವಾಗಿಯಾಗಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಕನ್ನಡಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ವಾಚೀನವ್ಯಾವಹಾರಿಕ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖಶಬ್ದದ ಸರ್ವಾಯವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಲ್ಪಡುವ ಮೋರೆ ಎಂಬ ದೇಶ್ಯಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೂ ಮೂರಿಯೆಂಬ ಈ ಪ್ರಾಚೀನಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿರಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಊಹಿಸುವುದು ಅಷ್ಟು ಅನುಚಿತವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇನ್ನು ಈ ಮೂರಿಶಬ್ದದಲ್ಲಿ ರಿ ಎಂಬುದು ರೇಫವೇ ಉಚಿತವೇ ಎಂಬ ಸಂದೇಹವನ್ನು ಅರ್ಥನೇಮಿಪುರಾಣದ ತಾರಗೆ ಎಂಬ ರೇಫದ ಪ್ರಸಂಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಈ ಶಬ್ದದ ರಿ ಎಂಬ ರೇಫವು ದೂರಮಾಡುವುದು.

## ೭. ಕಿರಾತ.

(ಆದಿಪುರಾಣ ಆ. ೪. ಪ. ೫೦ ರ ವಚನ)

ವಜ್ರದಂತನು ತನ್ನ ಮಗಳು ಶ್ರೀಮತಿಗೆ ಬಲುವಲಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ

(1) .....ಲೀಲಾಲಸಗಮನಮಂ ಗಜಗಮನೆಯರ್ಗುಪದೇಶಂಗೈಯ್ಯ ಕಲಹಂ  
 ಸಂಗಳುಮಂ, ಕುಬ್ಜವಾಮನ ಬಧಿರಮೂಕ ಕಿರಾತೋನ್ಮತ್ತಜಡಜನಂಗಳುಮಂ.....||

ಮತ್ತು ಭರತಚಕ್ರವರ್ತಿಯ ಜನ್ಮೋತ್ಸವಕಾಲದ ಅಂತಃಪುರವರ್ಣನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ-

(2) ಅಂತಃಪುರಸರಿವಾರಜನನಿರ್ದಯಸಮ್ಮದ್ಗನಿಪತಿತ ಕುಬ್ಜ ವಾಮನ ವರ್ಷಧರ  
 (ಕಿರಾತ) ನಿಕುರುಂಬಮುಂ

ಭರತಚಕ್ರವರ್ತಿಯೊಡನೆ ಅಂತಃಪುರದವರು ಹೊರಟಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ

(ಆ. ೧೧. ಪ. ೪೨.)

ಮು|| ಕರಿಣೀವೃಂದದಮೇಲೆ..... |

.....

ಭೃಂ ||

ಗರವಂಗಳ್ ಪ್ರಿಯಕುಬ್ಜವಾಮನ ಗಣಾಲಾಪಂಗಳತ್ಯಂತಸೌಂ |

ದರಶುದ್ಧಾಂತವಧೂಕದಂಬಕ ..... || ೧೪೨ ||

(ಗಣಾಲಾಪಂಗಳತ್ಯಂತ = ಕಿರಾತಾಲಾಪಮತ್ಯಂತ ಎಂದಿರಬಹುದು.)

ಎಂದು ಅದಿಪಂಪನು ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು 1 ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವನು.

ಈ ಶಬ್ದವು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಭಾಷೆಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದರೂ (ತತ್ಸಮ) ಇದನ್ನು ಕನ್ನಡಮಹಾಕವಿಗಳು ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಕಾವ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವರು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಕವಿಗಳೂ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವರು. ಆದರೆ ಇದರ ನಿಷ್ಕೃಷ್ಟಾರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಯಾರೂ ಮನಗಂಡಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದು ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಅನುಚಾನವಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಪಾಠಪ್ರವಚನಗಳಿಂದಲೂ, ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾನಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿರುವುದು.

ಈ ಶಬ್ದದ ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಮರ್ಶಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೊದಲು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಶಬ್ದದ ಪ್ರಯೋಗವನ್ನು ವಿಮರ್ಶಿಸಿ ಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗುವ ನಿರ್ಗಲಿತಾರ್ಥವನ್ನೇ ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಬಳಕೆಗೆ ತರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಶೇಷಸೌಕರ್ಯವುಂಟು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ಶಬ್ದಾರ್ಥವನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಣಯಿಸುವ 2 ಸಾಧನಗಳು ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿವೆ.

ಕಿರಾತ ಎಂಬ ಶಬ್ದವು ಬೇಡರು ಎಂಬರ್ಥದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಯುಕ್ತವಾಗಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಲವು ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳೂ ನಿಘಂಟುಗಳೂ ಶಬ್ದವೃತ್ತಿಯೂ ದೊರಕುವುವು. ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಭಾಷಾಸಾರ್ವಭೌಮನಾದ ಕಾಳಿದಾಸನು ತನ್ನ ಕುಮಾರಸಂಭವಕಾವ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಮಾಲಯಗಿರಿಯನ್ನು ವರ್ಣಿಸುವ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವ ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ “ವಿಂದಂತಿ ಮಾರ್ಗಂ ನಖರಂಧ್ರಮುಕ್ತೈರ್ಮುಕ್ತಾಫಲೈಃ ಕೇಸರಿಣಾಂ ಕಿರಾತಾಃ (ಸ ೧-ಪ. ೫) ಯದ್ವಾಯುರನ್ನಿಷ್ಪಮೃಗೈಃ ಕಿರಾತೈರಾಸೇವೃತೇ ಭಿನ್ನಶಿಖಂಡಿಬರ್ಹಃ

1. ೨ ಮತ್ತು ೩ ನೆಯ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭವಿದ್ದರೂ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಅದಿಪಂಪನು ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿದ್ದು ಬರುತ್ತ ಬರುತ್ತಾ ಹಸ್ತಲಿಖಿತಪ್ರತಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾರ್ಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಉಹಿಸಬಹುದಾದುದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದಿ ಬರೆದಿದೆ.

2. ಅರ್ಥನಿಷ್ಕರ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಸಾಧನಗಳಾದ ನಿಘಂಟುಗಳು, ವ್ಯಾಕರಣಗಳು, ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳು, ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯೆಗಳು ಮೊದಲಾದುವು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿರುವವು.

(೧-೧೬) ಈ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಗಳೆರಡರಲ್ಲೂ ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಡರು ಎಂಬ ಅರ್ಥವಲ್ಲದೆ ಮತ್ತಾವ ಅರ್ಥವೂ ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿರದು.

ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿರುವ ಕಾವ್ಯ ನಾಟಕಾದಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಪದಗಳ ಅರ್ಥಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸುವ ನಿಘಂಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅಮರಸಿಂಹಕೃತವಾದ ನಾಮಲಿಂಗಾನುಶಾಸನವು ಸರ್ವಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಇದರ ಶೂದ್ರವರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ-

ಚಂಡಾಲಪ್ಲವಮಾತಂಗ ದಿವಾಕೀರ್ತಿಜನಂ(ಸಂ)ಗಮಾಃ |

ನಿಷಾದಶ್ವಪಚಾವನ್ನೇವಾಸಿ ಚಾಂಡಾಲವುಕ್ಕ(ಲ್ಯ)ಸಾಃ ||

ಭೇದಾಃ ಕಿರಾತಶಬರವುಳಿಂದಾ ಮ್ಲೇಚ್ಛಜಾತಯಃ ||

(ಕಾಂ. ೨. ಶೂದ್ರ, ಪದ್ಯ. ೨೦.)

ಎಂದು ಆದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವರ್ಣಾಶ್ರಮಬಹಿಷ್ಕೃತರಾಗಿ ಅಂತ್ಯಜರೆನಿಸಿದ ಚಂಡಾಲರ ಪರ್ಯಾಯಪದಗಳನ್ನು ಚಂಡಾಲ, ಪ್ಲವ, ಮಾತಂಗ, ದಿವಾಕೀರ್ತಿ ಮೊದಲಾಗಿ ವುಕ್ಕಸ ಶಬ್ದದವರೆಗೂ ಹೇಳಿ ಕಿರಾತ, ಶಬರ, ಪುಳಿಂದರೆಂಬವರು ಚಂಡಾಲರ ಭೇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದವರೆಂದೂ, ಮ್ಲೇಚ್ಛಜಾತಿಯವರೆಂದೂ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ವ್ಯಾಧರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಮತ್ತು ಇದರ ಮುಂದಣ ಶ್ಲೋಕದಲ್ಲಿ “ವ್ಯಾಧೋ ಮೃಗವಧಾಜೀವೋ ಮೃಗಯುರ್ಲುಫ್ಲಕಶ್ಚ ಸಃ ||” ಎಂದು ಬೇಟೆಯಿಂದ ಜೀವಿಸುವ ಬೇಡರ ಪರ್ಯಾಯಪದಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿರುವನು. ಇದರಿಂದ ಅಮರಸಿಂಹನ ಮತದಂತೆ ಬೇಡರಿಗಿಂತ ಕಿರಾತರು ಭಿನ್ನರು ಎಂದಾಯಿತು. ಆದರೆ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಕವಿಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ ಕಿರಾತರನ್ನು ಬೇಡರೆಂದೇ ಹೇಳಿರುವರು. ಈ ಅಮರಕೋಶಕ್ಕೆ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿರುವವರು ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಅವಯವಾರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿರುವರು. ಅಮರವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಷ್ಕೃಷ್ಟವಾದ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳದೆ, ಇವರು ಮ್ಲೇಚ್ಛಜಾತಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದವರೆಂಬ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನೇ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು 1 ಕಿರಾತ, ಶಬರ, ಪುಳಿಂದಶಬ್ದಗಳು ಮೂರೂ ಮ್ಲೇಚ್ಛಜಾತಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ (ಮ್ಲೇಚ್ಛಾನಾಂ ಜಾತಯಃ ಅವಾಂತರಭೇದಾಃ) ಚಂಡಾಲರ ಭೇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿರುವವರನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವ ಶಬ್ದಗಳೆಂದು ಅರ್ಥಬರೆದು ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಿರತಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಎರಚುವನು, ಎಂದೂ, ಅತಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಅತತಿ-ನಿರಂತರವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುವವನು ಎಂದೂ ಹೇಳಿ ಕಿರಶ್ಚಾಸಾಅತಶ್ಚ ಎಂದು ಕರ್ಮಧಾರಯಸಮಾಸವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿರುವ ನಲ್ಲದೆ (ಎರಚುವವನೂ, ಸರ್ವದಾ ತಿರುಗುವವನೂ ಆದ ಮನುಷ್ಯ ಎಂಬ ಅನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವೂ,

1. ಕಿರಾತಾದಯಸ್ತಯೋ ಮ್ಲೇಚ್ಛಜಾತಯಃ ಚಂಡಾಲಭೇದಾಃ, ಯಸ್ಮುಮ್ಲೇಚ್ಛಶಬ್ದವಾಚ್ಯಾಃ ಇತಿ ಮುಕುಟಃ-ತನ್ನ, ಜಾತಿಪದವೈಯರ್ಥಪ್ರಸಂಗಾತ್, ಮ್ಲೇಚ್ಛಾಇತ್ಯೇವ ವಕ್ತುಂ ಯುಕ್ತತ್ವಾತ್ ...ಕಿರತಿ-ಕೃಪಾಪ್ರವೇಶ (ತು. ಪ. ಸೇ.) ಇಗುಪಥ (೩. ೧. ೧೩೫) ಇತಿಹಾ, ಅತತಿ....ಅತಸಾತತ್ಯ ಗಮನೇ (ಭಾ. ಪ. ಸೇ.) ಅಶಾ (೩. ೧. ೧೩೪) ಕಿರಶ್ಚಾಸಾವದ(ತ?)ಶ್ಚ || ಕಿರಾತೋ ಮ್ಲೇಚ್ಛಭೇದೇ ಸ್ಯಾತ್....ಯೋರಸಿ” ಇತಿ ಮೇದ್ವೀ,

ಅನನ್ವಿತವೂ ಅದ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿರುವನು.) ನಿಷ್ಕೃಷ್ಟವಾದ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ.  
ಮುಂದೆ ಮೈಚ್ಛಶಬ್ದಾರ್ಥವನ್ನು—

1 “ ಗೋಮಾಂಸಭಕ್ಷಕೋ ಯಸ್ತು ಲೋಕಬಾಹ್ಯಂ ಚ ಭಾಷತೇ |  
ಸರ್ವಾಚಾರವಿಹೀನೋಽಸೌ ಮೈಚ್ಛ ಇತ್ಯಭಿಧೀಯತೇ ||

ಸೂತಸಂಹಿತಾಯಾಮಪಿ—

2 “ ಬ್ರಾಹ್ಮಣ್ಯಾಂ ವೈಶ್ಯತೋ ಜಾತಃ ಕ್ಷತ್ರಾ ಭವತಿ ನಾಮತಃ |  
ಅಸ್ಯಾಮನೇನ ಚಾರ್ಯೇಣ ಮೈಚ್ಛೋ ವಿಪ್ರಾತ್ ಪ್ರಜಾಯತೇ || ”

ಎಂಬ ಅಧಾರದಿಂದ ವಿವರಿಸಿರುವನು. ಇದರಿಂದ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಕಿರಾತನು ಚಂಡ್ವಾಲರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಪಂಗಡಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಮೈಚ್ಛಜಾತಿಯವನೆಂಬುದು ಮಾತ್ರ ತಿಳಿದುಬರುವುದಲ್ಲದೆ ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲೇ ವಾಸಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ವನೇಚರರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬೇಟೆಯಿಂದ ಜೀವಿಸುವ ವ್ಯಾಧರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಂತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾಕಾರನಾದ ಕ್ಷೀರಸ್ವಾಮಿಯು ಈ ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಹೀಗೆ ವಿವರಿಸಿರುವನು. ಕಿರತಿ ಶರಣ ಇತಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಬಾಣವನ್ನು ಬೀರುವವನು ಎಂಬುದು ಆತನ ವೃತ್ತಿ. ಉಳಿದ ಅರ್ಥವಿವರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಸುಧಾಕಾರನಂತೆಯೇ ಹೇಳಿರುವನು.

ಟೀಕಾಸರ್ವಸ್ವಕಾರನು ಏತೇ ಕಿರಾತಾದಯಃ ಚಂಡಾಲಾನಾಂ ಭೇದಾಃ (ಈ ಕಿರಾತ, ಶಬರ, ಪುಲಿಂದರು ಚಂಡಾಲರ ಭೇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದವರು.) ಮೈಚ್ಛತಿ ಅವ್ಯಕ್ತಂ ಭಾಷತೇ ಇತಿ ಮೈಚ್ಛಾಃ (ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗದಂತೆ ಮಾತಾಡುವವರು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಮೈಚ್ಛರೆಂದು ಕರೆಯಲ್ಪಡುವರು.) ಮೈಚ್ಛ ಅವ್ಯಕ್ತೇ ಶಬ್ದೇ—ಪಚಾದ್ಯಚ್ (ಮೈಚ್ಛ ಎಂಬ ಪಚಾದಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಧಾತುವಿನವೇಲೆ ಅಚ್ ಪ್ರತ್ಯಯವು ಬಂದು ಮೈಚ್ಛ ಎಂದಾಗಿದೆ.) ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಮೈಚ್ಛರ ಸ್ವರೂಪವನ್ನು “ ಗೋಮಾಂಸ ಭಕ್ಷಕೋಯಸ್ತು ” ಎಂಬ ಪದ್ಯವನ್ನು ಉದಾಹರಿಸಿ—ಮಯೂರಪಿಚ್ಛಪರಿಧಾನೋ ಮೈಚ್ಛಃ (ನವಿಲುಗರಿಯನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿ

1. ಯಾವನು ಗೋಮಾಂಸವನ್ನು ತಿನ್ನುವನೋ, ಮತ್ತು ಲೋಕಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಗಾದ ಮಾತನ್ನಾಡುವನೋ (ಎಂದರೆ ಮೈಚ್ಛ ಅವ್ಯಕ್ತಶಬ್ದೇ ಎಂಬ ಧಾತುಪಾಠದ ಅಧಾರದಿಂದ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಲ್ಲದ ಮಾತನ್ನಾಡುವವನು ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥನಿರ್ವಚನಮಾಡಿರುವನು.) ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಆಚಾರಗಳನ್ನೂ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿರುವನೋ ಅವನು ಮೈಚ್ಛನು.

2. ಬ್ರಾಹ್ಮಣಸ್ತ್ರೀಯಲ್ಲಿ ವೈಶ್ಯಜಾತಿಯ ಪುರುಷನಿಂದ ಹುಟ್ಟಿದವನಿಗೆ ಕ್ಷತ್ರ ಎಂದು ಹೆಸರು. ಕ್ಷತ್ರಜಾತಿಯ ಹೆಂಗಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳ್ಳತನದಲ್ಲಿ ಬ್ರಾಹ್ಮಣನಿಂದ ಹುಟ್ಟಿದವನು ಮೈಚ್ಛನೆನಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವನು. ಎಂದು ವಿಶೋಮುಖಿಶ್ರಜಾತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದನ್ನಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ.

ಕೊಂಡಿರುವವನು ಮ್ಲೇಚ್ಛನು 1) ಪತ್ರಪರಿಧಾನಃ ಶಬರಃ, (ಎಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ಧರಿಸಿರುವವನು) ಸ್ವಭಾಷಾವ್ಯವಹಾರೀ ಪರಭಾಷಾನಭಿಜ್ಞಃ ಪುಳಿಂದಃ (ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಭಾಷೆಯು ತಿಳಿಯದೇ ಸ್ವಭಾಷೆಯಿಂದಲೇ ವ್ಯವಹರಿಸುವವನು ಪುಲಿಂದನು) ಎಂದು ವಿವರಿಸಿರುವನು.

ಲಿಂಗಾಭಟ್ಟೀಯವೆಂಬ ಅಮರವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ- “ ಗೋಮಾಂಸಭಕ್ಷಕೋಯಸ್ತು ” ಎಂಬ ಪದ್ಯದಿಂದ ಮ್ಲೇಚ್ಛರ ಲಕ್ಷಣವನ್ನು ವಿವರಿಸಿ ನವಿಲುಗರಿ ಮೊದಲಾದವನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವವನು ಕಿರಾತನು, ಎಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವವನು ಶಬರನು, ತಮ್ಮ ಭಾಷೆಹೊರತು ಪರಭಾಷೆಯನ್ನರಿಯದವನು ಪುಲಿಂದನು ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥಹೇಳಿ ಕಿರಾತ ಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೀತಿ ಶಬ್ದಂ ಕರೋತಿ ಕಿರಾತಃ=(ಕೀ ಎಂದು ಕೂಗುವವನು) ಎಂದು ವ್ಯುತ್ಪತ್ತಿಹೇಳಿರುವನು.

ಹೀಗೆ ಅಮರವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾಕಾರರೂಕೂಡ ಈ ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದದ ವ್ಯುತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯನ್ನೂ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನೂ ನಿಷ್ಪ್ರಸ್ತವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಕಿರಾತರು ವ್ಯಾಧರೆಂಬುದನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಕಾಳಿದಾಸನು 2 ವ್ಯಾಧಶಬ್ದವಾಚ್ಯರನ್ನೇ ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದವಾಚ್ಯರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವನೆಂಬುದು ಆಯಾ ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳಿಂದಲೇ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿದುಬರುವುದು. ಹೀಗೆ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದವು ಬಿಟ್ಟು, ಕಾಡು, ಬೇಟೆ ಮೊದಲಾದ ವರ್ಣನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯಾಧಶಬ್ದ ಪರ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿ ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿರುವುದೆಂದೂ, ಅಮರಕೋಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಮ್ಲೇಚ್ಛಜಾತಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಚಾಂಡಾಲಭೇದ ಮ್ಲೇಚ್ಛಜಾತಿಯವರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿರುವುದೆಂದೂ ತಿಳಿದುಬಂದಂತಾಯಿತು.

ಈ ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದವು ವನವರ್ಣನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂಟಿಯಾಗಿ ಬರುವುದಲ್ಲದೆ ಅಂತಃಪುರವರ್ಣನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಬ್ಜವಾಮನ ಕಿರಾತ ಎಂದು ಕುಬ್ಜವಾಮನ ಎಂಬ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಶಬ್ದಗಳೊಡನೆ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು.

ಕ್ರಿ. ಆರನೆಯಶತಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಭರತಖಂಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧರಾಜನಾಗಿದ್ದ ಶ್ರೀಹರ್ಷವರ್ಧನನಿಂದ ಬರೆಯಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿರುವ ರತ್ನಾವಳಿನಾಟಕದ ೨ ನೆಯ ಅಂಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂತಃಪುರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಿದ್ದ ಕಪಿಯೊಂದು ತನ್ನನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿದ್ದ ಸರಪಳಿಯನ್ನು ಕಿತ್ತುಹಾಕಿ ಸ್ವೇಚ್ಛೆ

1. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕಿರಾತನು ಎಂದಿರಬೇಕು. ಮುದ್ರಣಸ್ವಾಲ್ಪವೆಂದು ತೋರುವುದು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಕಿರಾತ ಶಬ್ದ ಪುಳಿಂದ ಶಬ್ದವಾಚ್ಯರಾದವರ ಸ್ವರೂಪವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಿರಾತ ಶಬ್ದವು ಬಿಟ್ಟುಹೋಗಿರುವುದು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಕಾಳಿದಾಸನು “ ಯದ್ವಾಯುರನ್ನಿಷ್ಕಮ್ಯಗೈಃ ಕಿರಾತೈರಾಸೇವ್ಯತೇ ಭಿನ್ನಶಿಖಂಡಿಬರ್ಹಃ ” ಎಂಬ ಪದ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಿರಾತರು ನವಿಲುಗರಿಯನ್ನು ಧರಿಸಿದ್ದವರು ಎಂದು ವರ್ಣಿಸಿರುವುದು ನವಿಲುಗರಿಯನ್ನು ಧರಿಸಿರುವವರು ಕಿರಾತರು (ಮ್ಲೇಚ್ಛರಲ್ಲ) ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟಗೊಳಿಸುವುದು.

2. ವ್ಯಾಭೋಮೃಗವಧಾಜೀವೀ ಮೃಗಯುರ್ಬುಕಶ್ಚ ಸಃ || (ಕಾಂ. ೨, ಶೂದ್ರ. ಪದ್ಯ ೨೦.)

ಯಾಗಿ ಓಡಿಬರುತ್ತಿರುವ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂತಃಪುರದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಪರಿಜನರ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ವರ್ಣಿಸುವ ಕವಿಯು—

ನಷ್ಟಂ ವರ್ಷವರೈಃ ಮನುಷ್ಯಗಣನಾಭಾವದಪಾಸ್ಯ ತ್ರಪಾಂ |  
ಅಂತಃಕಂಚುಕಿಕಂಚುಕಸ್ಯ ವಿಶತಿ ತ್ರಾಸಾದಯಂ ವಾಮನಃ ||  
ಪರ್ಯಂತಾಶ್ರಯಿಭಿಃ ನಿಜಸ್ಯ ಸದೃಶಂ ನಾಮ್ನಃ ಕಿರಾತೈಃ ಕೃತಂ |  
ಕುಬ್ಜಾ ನೀಚತಯೈವ ಯಾಂತಿ ಶನಕೈರಾತ್ಮೇಕ್ಷಣಾಶಂಕಿನಃ ||

[ (ವರ್ಷವರೈಃ) ಅರಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಯತವಾಗಿರುವ ನಪುಂಸಕರಿಂದ (ಮನುಷ್ಯಗಣನಾಭಾವಾತ್) ತಾವು ಮನುಷ್ಯರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಹೆಂಗಸರು ಗಂಡಸರೆಂಬ ಎರಡು ಬಗೆಯ ಮನುಷ್ಯಜಾತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಲೆಕ್ಕಕ್ಕೆ ಬರದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ (ತ್ರಪಾಂ ಅಪಾಸ್ಯ) ನಾಚುಗೆಯನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು (ನಷ್ಟಂ) ಕಾಣದೆಹೋಗೋಣವಾಯಿತು. (ಅಯಂವಾಮನಃ) ಈ ಕುಳ್ಳನು, (ಕಂಚುಕಿಕಂಚುಕಸ್ಯ) (ಕಂಚುಕಿ) ನಿಲುವಂಗಿಯನ್ನು ತೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಕಟ್ಟಿಗೆಯವರ (ಕಂಚುಕಸ್ಯ ಅಂತಃ) ನಿಲುವಂಗಿಯ ಒಳಗಡೆಯಲ್ಲಿ (ವಿಶತಿ) ಪ್ರವೇಶಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದಾನೆ (ಎಂದರೆ ಒಳಗೆ ಹೊಕ್ಕು ಮೈ ಮರೆಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿರುವನೆಂದು ಭಾವವು.) ಪರ್ಯಂತಾಶ್ರಯಿಭಿಃ—ಪರ್ಯಂತಭಾಗವನ್ನು ಆಶ್ರಯಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ (ಕಿರಾತೈಃ) ಕಿರಾತರಿಂದ (ಈ ಎರಡು ಶಬ್ದಗಳ ಶಬ್ದಾರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದಿದೆ. ತಾತ್ಪರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿಲ್ಲ.) (ನಿಜಸ್ಯನಾಮ್ನಃ) ತಮ್ಮ ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ, ಸದೃಶಂ—ತಕ್ಕದು, (ಕೃತಂ) ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿತು, (ಕುಬ್ಜಾಃ) ಕುಳ್ಳರು (ನೀಚತಯೈವ) ತುಂಬಾ ಕುಳ್ಳರಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದಲೇ (ಆತ್ಮೇಕ್ಷಣಾಶಂಕಿನಃ) ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಯಾರೂ ನೋಡಲಾರರು ಎಂದು ಹೆದರಿಕೆಯಿಲ್ಲದವರಾಗಿ ಎಂದರೆ ತಾವು ತುಂಬಾ ಕುಳ್ಳರಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಯಾರ ಕಣ್ಣಿಗೂ ಬೀಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬ ಧೈರ್ಯದಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿದವರಾಗಿ (ಶನಕೈಃ ಯಾಂತಿ) ಮೆಲ್ಲಗೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದಾರೆ.) ]

ಎಂಬೀ ಶ್ಲೋಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವನು. ಈ ಪದ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಿರಾತನ ವಿಷಯವಲ್ಲದೆ ವರ್ಷವರ (ನಪುಂಸಕ) ವಾಮನ (ಕುಳ್ಳ) ಕುಬ್ಜ (ತುಂಬಾ ಕುಳ್ಳ, ಈ ಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಗುಣುಬೆನ್ನುಳ್ಳ ಎಂದೂ ಅರ್ಥಹೇಳುವರು.) ಎಂಬ ಮತ್ತಿನ ಮೂವರ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಇದು ರಾಜನ ಅರಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂತಃಪುರದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಪರಿಜನರನ್ನು ವರ್ಣಿಸುವ ಪ್ರಕರಣವಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಇದರಿಂದ ಕಿರಾತನೆಂಬುವನು ಅಂತಃಪುರದ ಪರಿಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದವನೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ವರ್ಷಧರ, ವಾಮನ, ಕುಬ್ಜ ಇವರ 1 ಸಾಹಚರ್ಯವನ್ನೂ ಈ ಕಿರಾತನಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದು. ನಾವು ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳಿದ ವ್ಯಾಧಿ ಅಥವಾ ಚಂಡಾಲ ಭೇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದವನು ಎಂಬುವನು ಅಂತಃಪುರದಲ್ಲಿ

1. ಈ ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದವು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಕುಬ್ಜ ವಾಮನ ಕಿರಾತ—ಎಂದು ಕುಬ್ಜ ವಾಮನ ಶಬ್ದಗಳೊಡನೆ ಸಮಸ್ತಪದವಾಗಿಯೇ ಬರುತ್ತಿರುವುದು,

ಕುಬ್ಜ ವಾಮನರೊಡನೆ ಇದ್ದನೆಂಬುದು ಹೇಗೂ ಸಮಂಜಸವಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ಪದ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಅರ್ಥಹೇಳತಕ್ಕವರು ಈ ಕ್ಷಿಣ್ಣಾತಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ವ್ಯಾಧ ಎಂಬ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನೇ ಹೇಳಿ ಅವರು ಕಾವಲಿಗಾಗಿ ಅಂತಃಪುರದಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತಿದ್ದವರು ಎಂದೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವರು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕವರು ಈ ವಾಕ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಪರ್ಯಂತವನ್ನು ಆಶ್ರಯಿಸಿರುವವರಿಂದ ಎಂದರೆ ಊರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದಂತಿರುವ ಊರಹೊರಗಣ ಸ್ಥಳವನ್ನು ಎಂದರೆ ಕಾಡನ್ನು ಆಶ್ರಯಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವವರಾದ ಕಿರಾತರಿಂದ (ವ್ಯಾಧರಿಂದ) ತಮ್ಮ ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿತು. ಎಂದರೆ ಊರಹೊರಗಡೆಯ ಕಾಡನ್ನೇ ಆಶ್ರಯಿಸಿದರು ಎಂದರೆ ಕಾಡಿಗೆ ಓಡಿಹೋದರು ಎಂದು ಈ ವಾಕ್ಯದ ತಾತ್ಪರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವರು. ಇದನ್ನು ಸು. ೧೭ ನೆಯ ಶತಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಶಿಂಗರಾಯರಿಂದ ಬರೆಯಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿರುವ “ಮಿತ್ರಾ ವಿಂದಾ ಗೋವಿಂದಂ” ಎಂಬ ನಾಟಕದ ಪರಿವರ್ತನವು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟಗೊಳಿಸುವುದು. ಈ ಮಿತ್ರಾ ವಿಂದಾ ಗೋವಿಂದವು ರತ್ನಾ ವಳೀ ನಾಟಕೆಯ ಪಾತ್ರಗಳ ಮಾರ್ಪಾಡುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಪಡೆದು ಅಲ್ಲಿರುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನೇ ಒಳಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಹಳಗನ್ನಡದ ನಾಟಕೆಯಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ರತ್ನಾವಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ “ನಷ್ಟಂವರ್ಷವರೈಃ” ಎಂಬ ಪದ್ಯವು ಹೀಗೆ ಪರಿವರ್ತಿತವಾಗಿರುವುದು.

ಮ|| ಭರದಿಂ ಕೋಡಗಮೆಯ್ದೆ ಮೆಯ್ಯರೆದರಣ್ಣಂಗಳ್ ವಿಲಜ್ಜರ್ ಬಿಗು |  
 ತೀರವಂ ಕಾಣದೆ<sup>1</sup> ಗುಜ್ಜರಲ್ಲಿ ನುಗುಳ್ಳರ್ ತದ್ವಾರವಾಣಂಗಳೋಳ್ ||  
 ಸರಿದರ್ ತಾಂ ಪೊಲಗಾವ...<sup>2</sup> ಪೆಸರನಾಂತಿದಂ ತೆವೊಲ್ ಬಾಹ್ಯಚ |  
 ತ್ವರಮಂ ತಳ್ಳಿ ಕುನುಂಗುತುಂ ನಡೆಯುತಿದರ್ ಕೂನರುಂ ಬೇಗದೊಳ್ ||  
 (ಅಂ. ೨. ಪ. ೪೦.)

1. ಗುಜ್ಜ ಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಕುಬ್ಜ ಶಬ್ದದ ತದ್ಭವವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಕನ್ನಡಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳ್ಳರು ಎಂಬರ್ಥದಲ್ಲೇ ಪ್ರಯೋಗವಿದೆ. ತುಂಬಾ ಕುಳ್ಳರಿಗೆ ಗುಜ್ಜಾರಿ ಎಂದು ವ್ಯವಹಾರವು. ಅಂತಃಪುರದಲ್ಲಿ ಗುಜ್ಜರು (ಕುಳ್ಳರು) ಇದ್ದರೆಂದು ಕನ್ನಡಕಾವ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವರ್ಣನೆಗಳಿರುವುವು. “ಬಳಸಿದ ಗುಜ್ಜುಗಳ್ ನೆರೆದ ಮೇಳದ ಕನ್ನೆಯ ರೆತ್ತಮಿಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಚಳಿಸುವ ಚಾಮರಂ... ದೇಸವಿಳಾಸಮಂ ಪುದುಂಗೊಳಿಸಿ ಮರಲ್ಪ ಕನ್ನೆ ನಡೆನೋಡಿ ಗುಣಾರ್ಣವನೆಂಬನೀತನೇ (ವಿಕ್ರ. ಅ. ೪. ಪ. ೪೦.) ಗುಜ್ಜುಗಳ್-ಕುಳ್ಳರು ಎಂದು ಕ್ಲಿಷ್ಟ ಸದಾರ್ಥಗಳ ವಿವರಣಪಟ್ಟಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದರ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಯಶೋಧರಚರಿತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ-ನರಪತಿಯ ಗುಜ್ಜು ಸಿಕ್ಕಿ.....” ಎಂಬಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಪಾದಕರು ನರಪತಿಯ ಗುಜ್ಜು ಸಿಕ್ಕಿ ಎಂದು ಮುದ್ರಿಸಿ ಗುಜ್ಜು ಸಿಕ್ಕಿ ವಿನೋದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಂದು ಪ್ರಕರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಗತವಿಲ್ಲದ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿರುವರು.—ರಾಜನ ಅರಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಗುಜ್ಜು ಎಂದರೆ ಕುಳ್ಳನು ಆ ಮೊಸಳೆಗೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಲು ಎಂದು ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ಅರ್ಥ.

• 2. ಮೂಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯ ಕೆಲವು ಅಕ್ಷರಗಳು ಹೋಗಿವೆಯಾದುದರಿಂದ ಸಂಪಾದಕರು ಮೊದಲಣ ಮುದ್ರಣದ ಪ್ರತಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅಕ್ಷರಸ್ಥಾತಿತ್ವವನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸುವ ಚುಕ್ಕೆಗಳನ್ನಿಟ್ಟು ಎರಡನೆಯ ಮುದ್ರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಗಾವಲರ್ ಎಂದು ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಮುದ್ರಿಸಿರುವರು.



ಕೋಡಗವು ವೇಗದಿಂದ (ಭರದಿಂದ) ಬರಲು (ಎಯ್) ನಾಚುಗೆಯಿಲ್ಲದ ಹೇಡಿಗಳು (ಅಣ್ಣಂದಿರ್) ಮೆಯ್ಯನ್ನು ಮರೆಸಿಕೊಂಡರು. (ಮೆಯ್ಯರೆದರ್) ಗುಜ್ಜರು (ವಾಮನರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಕುಬ್ಜಶಬ್ದದ ತದ್ಭವವಾದ ಗುಜ್ಜರು ಎಂದು ಮಾರ್ಪಡಿಸಿರುವರು) ಹೊಣಿ ಗಾವಲವರು (ಕಿರಾತರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಹೇಳದೆ ಹೊರಗಾವಲರ್ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವರು.) ತಮ್ಮ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಪಡೆದಿದ್ದಂತೆ ಹೊರಗಣ 1 ಅಂಗಳವನ್ನು (ಬಾಹ್ಯ ಚತ್ವರಮಂ) ಕುರಿತು ಸರಿದರು. ಕೂಸರೂ (ಕುಬ್ಜಶಬ್ದದ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಾರ್ಥವನ್ನೇ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಗ್ರಹಿಸಿರುವರು) ಬಗ್ಗಿಕೊಂಡು (ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಂಠುಂಗಂತಂ) ಬೇಗದಿಂದ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. (ನಡೆಯುತಿರ್ದರ್ ಬೇಗದೋಳ್) [ಇವರ ಈ ಪರಿವರ್ತನದಲ್ಲಿ ತುಂಬಾ ಅಚಾತುರ್ಯ ವುಂಟು.—ಹೇಡಿಗಳು (ಮನುಷ್ಯಗಣನಾರ್ಥಾತ್ ಅಪಾಸ್ಯಕ್ರಪಾಂ) ಮನುಷ್ಯರ ಗಣನೆಗೆ ಬಾರದಿದ್ದುದರಿಂದ ನಾಚುಗೆಗೆಟ್ಟು ಎಂದರೆ ತಾವು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾದ ಒಂದು ಸಾಕಿದ ಕಪಿಗೆ ಹೆದರಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದಾದರೆ ಜನರು ನಗುವರು ಎಂಬ ನಾಚುಗೆಯನ್ನು ದೂರಮಾಡಿ ಎಂಬಲ್ಲಿ ಮನುಷ್ಯಗಣನಾರ್ಥಾತ್ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟಿರುವರು. ಕುಬ್ಜಶಬ್ದದ ತದ್ಭವವಾದ ಗುಜ್ಜಶಬ್ದದಿಂದ ವಾಮನನನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿರುವರು. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಕುಬ್ಜಶಬ್ದಾರ್ಥವಾದ ಕೂಸರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಕುಬ್ಜಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಳಿರುವರು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಕುಬ್ಜರು ತಾವು ಕುಳ್ಳರಾದುದರಿಂದ ಹೆದರಿಕೆಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಮೆಲ್ಲಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೂಸರು ಕುಗ್ಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಬೇಗನೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು ಎಂದು ವಿಪರೀತಾರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಗ್ರಹಿಸಿ ಪರಿವರ್ತಿಸಿರುವರು.]

ಈ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳಿದ ರತ್ನಾವಳಿನಾಟಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಿರಾತರು ಕಾವಲಿಗಾಗಿದ್ದ ವ್ಯಾಧರು ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಅರಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂತಃಪುರ ಸ್ತ್ರೀಯರ ಕಾವಲಿಗಾಗಿ ಇರಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಈ ಕಿರಾತರು ಕಾವಲಿಗಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕವರಾದುದರಿಂದ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಶೂರರಾಗಿಯೇ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ವ್ಯಾಧರೆಂದಾದರೆ ಅವರು ಹುಲಿ, ಸಿಂಹ, ಆನೆ ಮೊದಲಾದ ಕ್ರೂರಪ್ರಾಣಿಗಳನ್ನು ಬೇಟೆಯಾಡತಕ್ಕವರಾದುದರಿಂದ ಬಲಶಾಲಿಗಳೂ, ಧೈರ್ಯಶಾಲಿಗಳೂ ಆಗಿಯೇ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಇಂತವರು ಅಂತಃಪುರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಿದ್ದ ಕಪಿಯೊಂದು ಕಟ್ಟಿದ್ದ ಸರಪಳಿಯನ್ನು ಕಿತ್ತುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಾಗ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆದರಿಕೊಂಡು ತಾವು ವಾಸಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಕಾಡಿಗೆ ಓಡಿಹರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಎಷ್ಟುಮಾತ್ರವೂ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಲಾರದು. ಶಿಂಗರಾರ್ಯರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಂತೆ ಹೊರಗಾವಲವರು ಹೊರಗಣ ಅಂಗಳಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿದರು ಎಂಬರ್ಥದಲ್ಲಿಯಾದರೋ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪವೂ ಸಾಮಂಜಸ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೊರಗಣ ಅಂಗಳದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ನಿಯತವಾಗಿ ಕಾವಲಿಗಾಗಿದ್ದವರು

1. ಆದರೆ ಇವರು ಪರ್ಯಂತಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಗಣ ಅಂಗಳ ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿ ಹೊರಗಡೆಯ ಅಂಗಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾವಲಿಗಿದ್ದವರು ಹೊರಗಡೆಯ ಅಂಗಳವನ್ನೇ ಆಶ್ರಯಿಸಿ ಎಂದು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಭಿನ್ನಾರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿದ್ದರೂ ಕಾವಲಿಗಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕವರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಒಪ್ಪಿರುವರು.

ಕಸಿಯು ಬರುತ್ತಿದ್ದಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಳಭಾಗಕ್ಕೆ ಏತಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರು? ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾದ ಉತ್ತರವು ದೊರೆಯಲಾರದು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೊರಗಾವಲವರು (ಕಿರಾತರು) ವರ್ಷವರ, ವಾಮನ, ಕುಬ್ಜರಿಗಿಂತ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಭಿನ್ನರಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರನ್ನು ಇವರ ಸಾಹಚರ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರ್ವಥಾ ಸಂಗತವಾಗಲಾರದು. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದವು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಕಾವ್ಯಾದಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂತಃಪುರವರ್ಣನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಯುಕ್ತವಾಗಿರುವ ಉದಾಹರಣಗಳನ್ನು ಆರಿಸಿ ಆ ಉದಾಹರಣಗಳಿಂದ ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಅರ್ಥವು ಲಬ್ಧವಾಗುವುದೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಯಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದು ಪ್ರಕೃತಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಶ್ಯವಾಗಿರುವುದು.

ಸಾಶ್ವತ್ಯಪದ್ಧತಿಯಂತೆ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಶಬ್ದಗಳನ್ನು ಅಕಾರಾದಿಕ್ರಮದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಂಗಡಿಸಿ ಕೊಂಡು ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ (ಪ್ರಾತಿಪದಿಕ ಮತ್ತು ಧಾತುಗಳಿಗೆ) ಶಬ್ದವ್ಯುತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯೊಡನೆ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿರುವ ವಾಚಸ್ಪತ್ಯವೆಂಬ ನಿಘಂಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ (ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಡಿಕ್ಷನರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ) ಕಿರಾತ ಶಬ್ದದ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಬರೆದಿದೆ.

\* ಕಿರಾತ ಕಿರಮವಸ್ತುರಾದೇರ್ನಿಕ್ಷೇಪಸ್ಥಾನಂ (ಕಿರ ಎಂಬುದು ಕಸಕಡ್ಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಬಿಸಾಡುವ ಸ್ಥಳ) ಪರ್ಯಂತಭೂಮಿಂ (ಎಂದರೆ ಊರ ಎಲ್ಲೆಯ ಹತ್ತಿರದ ನೆಲ, ಅತತಿ (ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಚರಿಸುವವನು.) (ಅತ+ಅಣ್+ಉ-ಪ, ಸ) (1) ನೀಚಜಾತಿಭೇದೇ (ನೀಚಜಾತಿಯ ಒಂದು ಭೇದದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿರುವನು) ಸಚ ಅವಕರನಿಕ್ಷೇಪಸ್ಥಾನಪರ್ಯಂತ ದೇಶಾಶ್ರಯಃ) ಅವನೂಕೂಡ ಕಸಕಡ್ಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ನಿಕ್ಷೇಪಮಾಡುವ ಸ್ಥಾನದ ಹತ್ತಿರದ ದೇಶವನ್ನು ಆಶ್ರಯಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವವನು) ವ್ಯಾಧಾಬ- (ವ್ಯಾಧನೇ ಮೊದಲಾದವರು) ಮತ್ತು (2) ಕಿರಾತವೆಂಬುದು ಒಂದು ದೇಶ. ಅಲ್ಲ ವಾಸಮಾಡುವವರು ಕಿರಾತರು-

ತಪ್ತಕುಂಡಂ ಸಮಾರಭ್ಯ ರಾಮುಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಾಂತಿಕಂ ತಿವೇ |

ಕಿರಾತದೇಶೋ ವಿಜ್ಞೇಯೋ ವಿಂಧ್ಯಶೈಲೇಽವತಿಷ್ಠತೇ || (ಶಕ್ತಿ ಸಂಗಮೋಕ್ತೇ)

(3) ಚಾಮರಗ್ರಹಿಣ್ಯಾಂ (ಚಾಮರವನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿದಿರುವ ಹೆಂಗುಸಿನಲ್ಲೂ ಈ ಶಬ್ದವು ವರ್ತಿಸುವುದು) “ನೌಸಂಶ್ರಯಾಂ ಸಾರ್ವಗತಾಂಕಿರಾತೀಂ” ರಘೌ-(ಎಂದು ರಘುವಂಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಳಿದಾಸನ ಪ್ರಯೋಗವು) (4) ವ್ಯಾಧೇ- (ವ್ಯಾಧನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಮೃಗವಧೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಜೀವಿಸುವವನಲ್ಲಿ) “ಯದ್ವಾಯುರನ್ವಿಷ್ಟಮೃಗೈಃ ಕಿರಾತೈಃ” ಕುಮಾರ-(ಎಂದು ಕಾಳಿದಾಸನ ಕುಮಾರಸಂಭವಪ್ರಯೋಗ. (5) ಭೂಸಿಂಹೇ (ನೆಲಬೇವಿನಲ್ಲೂ) (6) ರಾಜನಿ (ರಾಜನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ) (7) ಅಲ್ಪತನೌ (ಚಿಕ್ಕಮೈಯುಳ್ಳವನು ಎಂದರೆ ತುಂಬಾ ಕುಳ್ಳನು) ಇತಿ ಮೇದಿನೀ (ಎಂದು ಮೇದಿನೀಕೋಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ)

ಎಂದು ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಅರ್ಥಗಳನ್ನು ಬರೆದು ತನ್ನ ವ್ಯುತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯನ್ನೂ (ಪರ್ಯಂತಾಶ್ರಯಿತ್ವ) ವ್ಯಾಧ ಮತ್ತು ಕುಳ್ಳ ಎಂಬರ್ಥಗಳನ್ನೂ ಸಾಧಿಸಲು ರತ್ನವಳಿ ನಾಟಕದ

“ ಪರ್ಯಂತಾಶ್ರಯಿಭಿಃ ನಿಜಸ್ಯ ಸದೃಶಂ ನಾಮ್ನಃ ಕಿರಾತೈಃ ಕೃತಂ ” ಎಂಬ ಭಾಗವನ್ನು ಉದಾಹರಿಸಿ ಹೀಗೆ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾನ ಮಾಡಿರುವನು. ಅತ್ರ ಸ್ವನಾಮಸದೃಶಂಚ (ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕಿರಾತರು ತಮ್ಮ ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ನಡೆಸಿದರು ಎಂಬ ಅರ್ಥದಲ್ಲಿ-ಪರ್ಯಂತಾಶ್ರಯಿತ್ವವೆಂದರೆ) ವಾನರಭಯಾತ್ ಸಂಕೋಚಿತ ದೇಹತ್ವೇನ ಅಲ್ಪತನುತ್ವಾತ್ (ಕಪಿಯ ದೇಸಿಯಿಂದ ಭಯ ಪಟ್ಟು ದೇಹವನ್ನು ಸಂಕೋಚಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡುದರಿಂದ ಚಿಕ್ಕ ದೇಹವುಳ್ಳವರಾದುದರಿಂದ) ಸ್ವನಾಮಸಮಾನಾನುಪೂರ್ವೀ ಬೋಧ್ಯಾಲ್ಪತನುತ್ವಕರಣಾತ್ (ತಮ್ಮ ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ಸಮಾನವಾದ ಅನುಪೂರ್ವಿಯಿಂದ ಬೋಧಿಸಲ್ಪಡುವ ಅಲ್ಪಶರೀರವನ್ನು (ಎಂದರೆ ಶರೀರಸಂಕೋಚವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದರಿಂದ ಎಂದು ಭಾವವು) ಪರ್ಯಂತಾಶ್ರಯಿತ್ವ ವಿಶೇಷಾಣಾದ್ವಾ- (ಪರ್ಯಂತಾಶ್ರಯಿತ್ವ ಎಂಬ ವಿಶೇಷಣದಿಂದಾಗಲಿ-ಎಂದು ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಹೊರಗೆ ಗ್ರಾಮಕ್ಕೆ ಹತ್ತಿರವಿರುವ ಕಾಡಿನ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸಮಾಡುವ ವ್ಯಾಧರೇ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನೂ, ಆ ವ್ಯಾಧರೇ ಅಂತಃಪುರದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರೆಂದೂ ಹೇಳಿ, ಮೇದಿನೀಕೋಶವನ್ನನುಸರಿಸಿ ಚಿಕ್ಕ ದೇಹವುಳ್ಳವನು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸಮನ್ವಯಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಆ ಅಂತಃಪುರದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ವ್ಯಾಧರೇ ಕೋಡಗವನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಭಯಪಟ್ಟು ದೇಹವನ್ನು ಚಿಕ್ಕದಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರು ಎಂದು ತಾತ್ಪರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿರುವನು. ಈ ಅರ್ಥದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಬೇಟೆಯಿಂದ ಜೀವಿಸುವ ವ್ಯಾಧರು ಅಂತಃಪುರದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಬೇಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಿಂಹಾದಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಲ್ಲತಕ್ಕ ಕಿರಾತರು ಅರಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಿದ್ದ ಕೋಡಗಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆದರಿಕೊಂಡರೆಂಬುದು ಅಸಂಭವವಾದ ವಿಷಯವೇ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಕೋಶಕಾರನ ಉಕ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮೇದಿನೀಕೋಶದ ಆಧಾರದಿಂದ ಅಲ್ಪತನು ಎಂಬ ಮತ್ತೊಂದರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಳಿದಂತಾಗಿರುವುದೊಂದೇ ವಿಶೇಷವಿಷಯವು.

ಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬ ನಿಘಂಟುಕಾರನಾದ ಶಬ್ದಾರ್ಥಕಲ್ಪದ್ರುಮಕಾರನು ವಾಚಸ್ಪತ್ಯನಿಘಂಟು ವಿನಂತಿಯೇ ವೃತ್ತತ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ-ವಿಕಲ್ಪವಾಗಿ ಕಿರಂ-ಸೂಕರಾದಿಕಂ (ಕಿರಂ ಎಂದರೆ ಹಂದಿ ಮೊದಲಾದುವನ್ನು) ಅತತಿ ಹಿಂಸ್ರಿ ಅಥವಾ (ಅತತಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಹಿಂಸಿಸುವವನು ಎಂದಾಗಲಿ ವೃತ್ತತ್ತಿಮಾಡಬಹುದು) ಮ್ಲೇಚ್ಛಭೇದಃ (ಮ್ಲೇಚ್ಛಜಾತಿಯ ಭೇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದವನು ಎಂದು ಬರೆದು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಿರಾತಾರ್ಜುನೀಯದ “ಅನ್ವೀತಃ ಸ ಕತಿಪಯೈಃ ಕಿರಾತೈಃ” ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಯೋಗವನ್ನಿತ್ತು, ಅಲ್ಪತನುರಿತಿ ಮೇದಿನೀ - ಎಂದು ಅಲ್ಪತನು ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳಿರುವನು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯೋಗವನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಇವನು ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಮತ್ತು ಘೋಟಕರಕ್ಷಕಃ (ಕುದುರೆಕಾಯುವವನು) ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವನು.

ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಲ್ಮೀಕಿಮಹರ್ಷಿಪ್ರಣೀತವಾಗಿ ಆದಿಕಾವ್ಯವೆಂದು ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿರುವ ಶ್ರೀಮದ್ರಾಮಾಯಣಕಾವ್ಯದ ಆಯೋಧ್ಯಾಕಾಂಡದ ೧೫ ನೆಯ ಸರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀರಾಮಚಂದ್ರನನು, ಕರೆತರಲು ದಶರಥನಿಂದ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ಸುಮಂತ್ರನು ಬಂದು ಶ್ರೀರಾಮಚಂದ್ರನ ಅರಮನೆಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದನು ಎಂಬ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ-

## DEATH OF ODĒNAN

By

DR. CHELNAT ACHYUTA MENON, PH.D. (LONDON),  
*Head of the Department of Malayālam*

In this Ballad is described the fight between Taccōli Odēnan, the famous hero of Kadattanad, N. Malabar, and Matilūr Kurukkaḷ, a contemporary teacher of Fencing. The following are the details of the story :—

Odēnan is busy making arrangements for the festival at Lokanār Kāvu (near Badagara), a well known Kālī temple. Odēnan is a great devotee of the 'Mother' to whom the temple is dedicated. The Pandal\* which is Odēnan's turn to build is completed. Matilūr Kurukkaḷ, a fencing master, who is jealous of Odēnan's reputation comes to see the Pandal. After exchange of the usual courtesies Kurukkaḷ points out certain defects in the construction of the Pandal which naturally puts Odēnan and his followers out of sorts. Words grow hotter and the conversation ends in a challenge, within next Sunday which Odēnan accepts. Ponniyam near Mahe was fixed as the venue for the fight. Odēnan's brother Kōma Kuṟup anticipates trouble for his brother as Matilur Kurukkaḷ is a redoubtable fighter much more experienced than his younger brother and plans with Cāppan<sup>1</sup> and Payyampallī Candu<sup>2</sup> to keep Odēnan out of the fight. It is a critical period in Odēnan's life; hence their anxiety. On the appointed day Odēnan is locked up in his bed-room in his wife's house. His friends and Kōma Kuṟup go to the fight with their followers.

Meanwhile Matilur Kurukkaḷ secretly interviews Kunhi Tēyi—Odēnan's paramour and persuades her by an offer of money to remove the Tālisman which Odēnan wears and which is supposed to protect him from evil influences or calamities.

\*A temporary structure around the temple with a flat roof supported by pillars, meant as a shelter from Sun for those who come to witness the festival.

1. An inseparable companion of Odēnan.
2. A friend of Odēnan.

When the fight is going on in all its grim horror Odēnan suddenly wakes up in his room. When he finds himself locked up, calls his wife for a cup of milk. When the door is opened, he gets out and starts for the fight consoling his wife with soothing words. At the sight of the venue he makes a challenging shout by striking the shield on his thigh indicative of his determination and vengeance. Kōma Kuṛup hears his voice and asks Cāppan to remove the bridge that is over the mote surrounding the battle field to prevent Odēnan from getting in. The bridge is instantly removed, but that is of no avail. By performing a somersault Odēnan crosses the mote and in another leap he is in the midst of his people fighting for their honour. He pounces on the fencing master like a tiger and kills him in no time. The fight ends and the party returns triumphantly. On coming half way Odēnan remembers the dagger he has left in the field and wants to go back to take it. His brother and friends remonstrate him not to do so, as it is against military conventions for the victor to return after dark to the field full of dead bodies. But strong-willed as he is, Odēnan goes. One of Kurukkaḷ's men, a Moplah who was hiding in the neighbourhood shoots Odēnan on the forehead. The foul play is immediately avenged by another belonging to Odēnan's party, a Tiyya youth, who kills the assassin by an arrow.

The wound proves fatal and Odēnan returns home helped by his brother and friends to bid them all farewell. In his death-bed he requests his brother to transfer some of his properties to his wife Cīru and give a living to the Tiyya youth who killed his murderer.

Logan in his 'Manual'\* has translated portions of this ballad. But that version differs from this in certain details. This gives us a glimpse into the lives of the heroes of Malabar in by-gone days and show how small incidents or even jokes end in big tragedies. They held honour higher than anything else and was prepared to fight on trivial issues, as they took to fighting as a profession and pastime. Other aspects of the Ballad will be dealt with in the 'Life of Odēnan' which the writer is preparing.

This is the first time that this Ballad which is very popular, is edited with notes with a view to arrive at the correct text.

\*Logan, Malabar Manual, Vol. I, pages 97-101.

## ഒതേനന്റെ മരണം.

By

DR. CHELNAT ACHYUTA MENON, PH.D. (LONDON),  
Head of the Department of Malayālam

തച്ചോള്യല്ലോമനക്കത്തെയാതേനൻ  
പറയുന്നല്ലോമനക്കത്തെയാതേനൻ :—

“കണ്ടാച്ചേര്യോമനക്കത്തിച്ചാപ്പ!

ലൊവണ്ണ ഞാവി<sup>1</sup>ലങ്ങാണേ ചാപ്പ!

ആറാട്ടുമങ്ങല<sup>2</sup> മടുത്തപായല്ലോ.

ഉമ്മളെ<sup>3</sup>ടുക്കേണ്ടൊരു പന്തപ്പണി

നല്ലോണെടുക്കണേ കഞ്ഞിച്ചാപ്പ!

കേക്കുമലക്കണ്ണ<sup>4</sup> പോടെ ചാപ്പ!

വേണ്ടാമരം കൊത്തിച്ചാപ്പിച്ചിട്ട്<sup>5</sup>

കേക്കൻപുഴക്കു തിരപ്പ<sup>6</sup>കെട്ട്!

മുവരാട്ടെന്ന്<sup>7</sup> കടവത്താണു്

അവിടെ മരവും തടുത്തൊ<sup>8</sup> ചാപ്പ!

കോതീലും<sup>9</sup> തന്നെയടുപ്പിച്ചോളെ

വണ്ടിവഴിക്കേ മരം വരുത്തി

ലൊവണ്ണ ഞാവിത്തിരുമുവില്

ആട മരംകൊണ്ടക്കീച്ചോ ചാപ്പ!

ഉമ്മളെ പന്തപ്പണിക്കാണല്ലെ

നല്ലോണെടുക്കണം പന്തപ്പണി.

ഉമ്മളെ പന്തപ്പറമേ കൂടി

ആന കുതിരേനെ ച്ചാടിക്കേണം.

എണ്ണായിരം തണ്ടും കാലും വേണം

---

1. ലോകനാർകാവു്, കടത്തനാട്ടു് ഒരു പ്രധാനപ്പെട്ട കാളിക്കേതും.

2. മംഗലം.

3. നമ്മൾ എന്നതിന്റെ ഭേദം.

4. താഴത്തിട്ട്. അടയാളപ്പെടുത്തി എന്നും അർത്ഥം.

5. ഒന്നിച്ചുകൂട്ടി കെട്ടി ഒഴുക്കി.

6. സ്ഥലപ്പേര് മുരിയം<sup>7</sup> എന്നും പറയും.

7. പിടിച്ചു നിത്തുക.

8. സ്ഥലപ്പേര്.

എണ്ണായിരം മടലോല വേണം.  
 വിന്നെയും കേക്കണേ കുഞ്ഞിച്ചാപ്പ!  
 ഉമ്മളെ പന്തപ്പണിക്കൻറുടെ  
 മുച്ചായിരംകെട്ടു നാളും വേണം.  
 പിന്നെയും കേക്കൻറ കുഞ്ഞിച്ചാപ്പ!  
 ഉമ്മളെ പന്തപ്പണിയാണല്ലോ  
 പതിനെട്ടുനാട്ടിലും കേളിപോണം.”  
 കണ്ടാച്ചേര്യോമനക്കുഞ്ഞിച്ചാപ്പൻ  
 കേക്കൻമലക്കല്ലേ പോകുന്നത്.  
 വേണ്ടും മരമെല്ലാം കൊത്തിക്കുന്നു;  
 കേക്കൻപഴക്കം തിരപ്പുകെട്ടി  
 മുവരാട്ടും മരാടുപ്പിക്കുന്നു;  
 വണ്ടിക്കരമ്മരം കൊണ്ടേപാരുന്നു;  
 ലെവണ്ണ ക്കാവിത്തരിമുന്തിലു്  
 അവിടെ മരം കൊണ്ടെക്കീച്ചേ<sup>1</sup> ചാപ്പൻ  
 എണ്ണായിരം തണ്ടും കാലുമായി;  
 എണ്ണായിരംമടലോലയായി;  
 മുച്ചായിരംകെട്ടു നാളുമായി;  
 തെക്കുംപുറം നല്ല പന്തപ്പണി  
 നല്ലോണെടുപ്പിച്ചേ കുഞ്ഞിച്ചാപ്പൻ.  
 പതിനെട്ടു നാട്ടിലും കേളിപോയി!  
 കതിരൂരുന്നാട്ടിലും കേളിപോയി!  
 കതിരൂക്കരിക്കളും ശിഷ്യന്മാരും  
 വറ്<sup>2</sup>ത്താന<sup>2</sup>റിത്തക്കരിക്കളു്താനോ.  
 പറയുന്നല്ലനേരം കരിക്കളല്ലെ :—  
 “ഇരുപത്തിരണ്ടൻറ ശിഷ്യന്മാരേ.  
 ഞാനൊരു കേളിതം<sup>3</sup> കേട്ടിട്ടുണ്ട്  
 മേപ്പയിലെ തച്ചോളിക്കുഞ്ഞയാത്രേനൻ  
 ലെവണ്ണ ക്കാവിലങ്ങാണു് പോലും  
 ഓനൊരു പന്തപ്പണിയെടുത്തു്

1. കിഴിച്ച=ഇറക്കി.

2. വത്തമനം.

3. ജനങ്ങളുടെ ഇടയിലുള്ള സംസാരം.

ആനകുതിരേനേയോട്ടുട്ടെന്ന്<sup>1</sup>  
 ഞാനൊരു കേളിതം കേക്കുന്നല്ലോ.  
 ഉമ്മക്കപ്പന്തപ്പണി കാണണ്ടെ?  
 ഉമ്മയ്ക്ക് പോയെന്റെ ശിഷ്യനാരോ?”

പോരുന്നല്ലോമനക്കരിക്കുത്താനോ  
 കാവിലല്ലാറാട്ടുപൂരത്തിന്.  
 ഓലിന്നക്കാവിനത് ചെല്ലുന്നല്ലോ  
 ഓലിന്നക്കാവിനത് ചെല്ലുംനേരം  
 മേപ്പയിലെ തച്ചോളിക്കുഞ്ഞത്യാതേനൻ  
 ഓനം അതോൻറുടൊരു<sup>2</sup> ചങ്ങാത്രേളം<sup>3</sup>  
 ലെവണ്ണ കാവിത്തിരുമുവിന്  
 ഏളകിക്കളിക്കുന്ന് കുഞ്ഞത്യാതേനൻ.

കുതിരക്കരിക്കളം ശിഷ്യനാരും  
 പന്തപ്പണി നോക്കിക്കണ്ടാണ്ടല്ലോ.  
 പയ്യംപള്ളോമനക്കഞ്ഞിച്ചന്തു<sup>4</sup>  
 പറയുന്നണ്ടാമനക്കഞ്ഞിച്ചന്തു:—  
 “കുതിരക്കരിക്കളേ! ശിഷ്യനാരോ!  
 വെറില മുറുക്കീട്ടു നോക്കൊമ്മ്ക്ക്.”<sup>5</sup>  
 കണ്ടാച്ചേരിക്കുഞ്ഞിച്ചാപ്പുന്നല്ലെ  
 കുതിരക്കരിക്കളെ തലയിലാണ്  
 പൂ വാരിത്തുവുന്നേ കുഞ്ഞിച്ചാപ്പൻ.  
 ചോദിക്കുന്നനേരം കുരുക്കുത്താനോ.—  
 “പയ്യംപള്ളോമനക്കഞ്ഞിച്ചന്തേപാ!  
 പൂമഴയും പൂ തുവുവലുണ്ടോ ചന്തേപാ!  
 ഇന്നിക്ക് നാട്ടാരങ്ങാണെ! ഇപ്പം  
 ടേന്തുറു മുന്തുറു ദേവന്മാരൊ!”<sup>6</sup>

1. കുടിച്ചുവെന്ന്.      2. അവൻറടയ + ഒരു.      3. ചങ്ങാതികളും.

4. കരേനന്റെ ചങ്ങാതിയും, നല്ലൊരുജ്ഞാസിയുമായ ഒരു വീരൻ.

5. നോക്കും നമ്മൾക്ക്.

6. ഇത് ഒരു നൂട്ടരങ്ങ് പോലിരിക്കുന്നു. ദേവന്മാർ ഒന്നുറോ മുന്തുറോ ? ഇവിടുത്തെ ഒരുക്കങ്ങൾ കണ്ടാൽ ദേവന്മാർ അനവധിയുണ്ടെന്നും, അവർക്കുപ്രവർത്തനം വേണ്ടിച്ചെല്ലാൻ നിനക്കു പ്രത്യേകം അധികാരമുണ്ടെന്നും തോന്നുമെന്ന് പരിഹാസം.



പുകരം പറഞ്ഞല്ലോ കഞ്ഞിച്ചുതു :—

“കുതിരക്കുരിക്കളെ! ശിഷ്യന്മാരേ!

നീങ്ങളെ തരത്തിനൊന്നൊപ്പിച്ചാലോ

ഇന്നിടം നാട്ടാരോ തേവർത്തനെ.”<sup>1</sup>

അരിശം നടിക്കുന്നു കുരിക്കളുതാനൊ-

കതിരുകുരിക്കളും ശിഷ്യന്മാരും

താണും ചരിഞ്ഞുപല്ലെ നോക്കുന്നതു്.

ചോദിക്കുന്നപന്നേരം കഞ്ഞയാതേനൻ :—

“താണും ചരിഞ്ഞുപല്ലാം നോക്കുന്നെന്തു്?

പന്തപ്പണിക്കേതാൻ കുററം കണ്ടോ?”

“മേപ്പയിലെ തച്ചോളി കഞ്ഞയാതേന്റെ

പന്തപ്പണിക്കു ഞാൻ കുററം കണ്ടേ!

തെക്കുപുറത്തൊരു തുണുപോരാ;

വടക്കുപുറത്തൊരു വിട്ടുപോരാ;

കാണുന്ന കാഴിച്ചു് കാണൊതേന!

കേട്ടോരു കേളിക്കൊട്ടെപ്പാക്കുന്നില്ല.”

അത്തരം വാക്കാടക്കേക്കുന്നേരം

പച്ചുപള്ളോമനക്കഞ്ഞിച്ചുതു

അരിശം നടിച്ചല്ലോ കഞ്ഞിച്ചുതു.

“തച്ചോളുല്ലോമനക്കഞ്ഞയാതേനൻ

തെയനനെപ്പിച്ച പന്തപ്പണി

പന്തപ്പണിക്കുററം കല്പിക്കാനേ

ആണൊയൊരുത്തനിന്നുണ്ടോ ഇപ്പം?”

അരിശം നടിക്കുന്നു കുരിക്കളാണു്!

കരിങ്കണ്ണുരുട്ടി മറിക്കുന്നല്ലോ<sup>4</sup>

കരിഞ്ഞൊടരോമം വിറപ്പിക്കുന്നു.<sup>5</sup>

“പയ്യംപള്ളോമനക്കഞ്ഞിച്ചുനെപാ,  
 ഞാനൊരുകേളിതം കേട്ടിട്ടുണ്ട്,  
 തച്ചൊളിമാണിക്കൊത്ത് കഞ്ഞത്യാതേനൻ  
 കടത്തുവൈനാട്ടെ പ്പടമുകുത്ത്  
 ഓനൊരു മുട്ടേല് പൂവനാൻ.”<sup>1</sup>

പകരം പറഞ്ഞല്ലോ കഞ്ഞത്യാതേനൻ :—  
 “കതിരൂക്കരിക്കളെ! ശിഷ്യന്മാരെ!  
 ഞാനൊരുകേളിതം കേട്ടിട്ടുണ്ട്;  
 കതിരൂർ നാട്ടിൽപ്പടമുകുത്ത്  
 നിങ്ങളൊരുമുട്ടെ(ൽ)പ്പെട<sup>2</sup>യാണെന്ന്.”

അരിശം നടിക്കുന്നു കുരിക്കളാണെ!  
 “തച്ചൊളൊതയന! നാട്ടുകാരെ!  
 ഉമ്മളിപ്പോരുന്നതും പോരാത്തതും  
 മേലിലുവരും മുമ്പും ഞാനാഴ്ന്നു,  
 ഞാനാഴ്ന്നു നല്ലഭിവസത്തിന്,  
 പൊന്നിയം<sup>3</sup> പുത്തൻകുളരിക്കുന്ന്,  
 ആടവച്ചാട്<sup>4</sup> തീർക്കാലോ.”  
 സംകപ്പൊയിത്തു<sup>5</sup> കുറിച്ചു ഓല്  
 തമ്മിൽ പറഞ്ഞു പിരിഞ്ഞൊളന്നു.

തച്ചൊളി കോമക്കുറപ്പെന്നോർ  
 വർത്താനറിഞ്ഞ കുറപ്പല്ലാൺ.  
 നിലംകൊള്ളായ് കൊണ്ടു വീഴുന്നല്ലോ.  
 “ഉയയീ<sup>6</sup> വിധിബലം കഞ്ഞത്യാതേന!  
 ഇണക്കിത<sup>7</sup> നല്ലൊരു കുരിക്കളപ്പാ!

- 
1. പൂച്ചന്തുകോഴി—ചൊടിയുള്ള പുരുഷനാണെന്നു സാരം. പരിഹാസിക്കുകയാണു്.
2. പിടക്കോഴി—കുരുക്കളെ ഇടിച്ച് പറകയാണു്.
3. മയ്യഴിക്കുകയുള്ള സ്ഥലം.
4. നാട്ടുകാർ എല്ലാവരും ചെന്നു യുദ്ധം.
5. നിലത്തുനില്ക്കുൻ കഴിയായ്ക്ക. പരിഭ്രമംകൊണ്ടാണെന്നു സാരം.
6. അയ്യോ!
7. ഇണയായിട്ടുള്ള ഇവ കുരുക്കൾ നല്ലവരാണ്. അപ്പാ! ഇയാൾ സാമാന്യനല്ലെന്നു സാരം.

കുതിരുകുരിക്കളം ശിഷ്യനാരു  
 നിമിട്ടും വെട്ടും പട പന്തിരാണ്ടു്;  
 ഇരുന്നിട്ടും വെട്ടും പട പന്തിരാണ്ടു്;  
 ഏയന്നെ<sup>1</sup>റുവോടും വെട്ടും പട;  
 പറക്കും പരുത്തോടും വെട്ടും പട;  
 പതിനെട്ടുനാട്ടിൽ കളരിയുണ്ടു്,  
 പതിനെട്ടു ജില്ലേലുള്ളൊളു്ക്കാരും  
 ഓലയുടെ പൊന്നും കളരിക്കുല്  
 കടത്തുവൈനാട്ടിനെറക്കുറുളഞ്ഞു്?''<sup>2</sup>

തച്ചോളുല്ലോമനക്കുഞ്ഞുതാതേനൻ  
 പഴുക്കടക്കുപോലത്തെ കുഞ്ഞിമ്മീടു്<sup>3</sup>  
 പൂപ്പോലെമാളി<sup>4</sup> മയക്കിപ്പോയി.  
 ഉത്തരോയില്ല പ്റതിയുല്ല.<sup>5</sup>  
 കാവിലെപ്പൊന്നമ്മ ഭഗവതീന്റെ  
 ആറാട്ടുപൂരക്കളികഴിഞ്ഞു്  
 പതിനെട്ടുനാട്ടിലുള്ളൊളു്ക്കാരും  
 ഏല്ലാരുംതന്നെ മടങ്ങുന്നല്ലോ.  
 പരുത്തുംകൂലെയമ്മൻ<sup>6</sup> പണിക്കരാണ്  
 അന്നടത്തൂരം നടന്നുടിട്ടു്  
 കയ്യുണ്ടടത്തിലും വന്നുകേറി  
 കയ്യുണ്ടടത്തിലെ കുഞ്ഞിത്തേയി<sup>1</sup>  
 ആചാരത്തുംവണ്ണാടക്കത്തോടെ  
 “എന്തായിവന്ന് കുരിക്കളെന്നെ?”  
 പകരം പറഞ്ഞു കുരിക്കളാണ് :—  
 “കയ്യുണ്ടടത്തിലെ തേതയിയമ്മ!

1. ഇഴയുന്ന.

2. കടത്തന്നാടിന്റെ വില ഇറക്കിക്കളഞ്ഞു.

3. മീടു്=മുഖം.

4. വാടി. ചോരത്തില്ലപ്പുള്ള മുഖം വിളറിയെന്നർത്ഥം. ഉപമയുടെ സ്വര സ്വരം നോക്കുക.

5. പ്രതി=മറുവടി.

6. വീടുപേര്. ഇയാൾ കുതിരുകുരിക്കൾക്കു് അനുക്രമിയാണ്.

7. ഭരതനന്റെ ഒരു ഭാര്യ.

ആറൊന്നുപൊന്നിൻവൃക്ഷം<sup>1</sup> ആലും,  
 തെയനൻവൃക്ഷം ആലപാണേ ഇപ്പം;  
 മേലിച്ഛവരുംമുമ്പും ഞാറാഴ്ചുക്ക്  
 പൊന്നിയമ്പുത്തം കുളരിക്കല്പ്  
 തെയനൻ പൊയിത്തിനു വരുന്നേരത്തു്  
 ഓൺറ അരയിലതുണ്ടാവറ്<sup>2</sup>.”

“ആ”യെന്നുവാദം കഞ്ഞിത്തേയി,  
 ഒരുപെട്ടി പൊന്നാടെ വാങ്ങിവെച്ചേ.

ഞാറാഴ്ചവന്നു പുലന്നോളന്നു  
 കുററപ്പറം വാണ തമ്പുരാനെ!  
 തിരുമേനിക്കുള്ള നല്ലാളു്ക്കാരും  
 ചീനംവീട്ടിൽ<sup>3</sup>തങ്ങളു് വാഴുന്നോരും  
 മാണിക്കോത്തു്<sup>4</sup>വന്നു നിറയുന്നല്ലൊ.  
 ഓമനപ്പുക്കോട്ടു് നമ്പിയാരും<sup>5</sup>  
 നാട്ടിപ്പതിനായിരവും വന്നോളന്നു.  
 തോക്കു തിളങ്ങുന്നൊരുപാത്തു്<sup>6</sup>;  
 ഉണ്ടമുറിക്കുന്നൊരുപാത്തു്<sup>6</sup>;  
 വില്പവളക്കുന്നൊരുപാത്തു്<sup>6</sup>;  
 അമ്പുതൊ(തു)ടക്കുന്നൊരുപാത്തു്<sup>6</sup>.  
 പാരം പാരുള്ളെല്ലുരുതിപ്പാട്ടു്<sup>7</sup>  
 തച്ചോളിക്കോമക്കുറപ്പെല്ലാണു്!  
 പടിഞ്ഞാററാം പൊഞ്ചുരൽക്കട്ടിനേലു്  
 കുമ്പിട്ടായ്ക്കൊണ്ടു വീണിക്കല്ലൊ.

1. ഉറക്കു്—ഒരുതരം തകിട്ടു്. മന്ത്രമെഴുതിക്കെട്ടിയതാകകൊണ്ടു് അതിന്നു പ്രത്യേകിച്ചു് ശക്തിയുണ്ടു്. ഒരുതരം രക്ഷയാണതു്.

2. ഉണ്ടാവരുതു് എന്നതിന്റെ ദേശ്യം.

3. നാട്ടിലെ പ്രമാണി. കേതനന്റെ അർക്കുൻ ചീനംവീട്ടിലെ ഒരു വാഴുന്ന വരണേന്നു് ഒരു പാട്ടിൽ പ്രസ്താവിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടു്.

4. കേതനന്റെ വീടുപേരു്.

5. മറ്റൊരു പ്രമാണി.

6. ഭാഗത്തുനിന്നു്.

7. ഉറതി=ഉറപ്പു്. ഏതുകാലത്തിലും ഉറച്ച മനസ്ഥിതിയുള്ളവൻ.

പയ്യംപള്ളിമാനക്കുഞ്ഞിച്ചുതു  
 ചോദ്യക്കുഞ്ഞുമാനക്കുഞ്ഞിച്ചുതു :—  
 തച്ചോളിക്കോമക്കുറപ്പെ! ഓളി!<sup>1</sup>  
 എന്തൊരയപ്പാട് കുറപ്പിന് ഓളി!”

“പയ്യംപള്ളിച്ചുന്തെ! പൊന്നകനെ!  
 ഉയയി! വിധിബലം കുഞ്ഞിച്ചുന്തെ!  
 തച്ചോളൊതയനൻ നേരനിയൻ  
 ഓൻറുടെ ജാതം<sup>2</sup> ഞാൻ നോക്കിച്ചല്ലോ.  
 ഇന്നൊരു കട്ട(പ്പ)ദശയാണോൻ.  
 പയ്യംപള്ളിമാനക്കുഞ്ഞിച്ചുന്തെ!  
 ഇൻറെ വെളവ്കൊണ്ടും വിദ്യകൊണ്ടും  
 ഓനെ പ്പൊയ്ത്തിനു കൂട്ടറിച്ച്.”

പയ്യംപള്ളിമാനക്കുഞ്ഞിച്ചുതു  
 ഓൻറെ വെളവ്കൊണ്ടും വിദ്യകൊണ്ടും  
 തച്ചോളൊതച്ചു<sup>3</sup> കുറപ്പിന്റാണു്  
 പടിഞ്ഞാറേറലാക്കുല്ലേ പൂട്ടുനതു്.

ആടക്കൂട്ടു<sup>4</sup>ളൊരു മുപ്പായിരം  
 ആതു് വിളിച്ചു പറപ്പെടുന്നു.

മേപ്പയിലെ തച്ചോളി കുഞ്ഞുപ്രാതേനൻ  
 പൊന്നെഴുത്ത്നുള്ള പടകേട്ടിട്ടു്  
 വാതിലടച്ചാത്തി<sup>5</sup>രുന്നും കൂടാ;  
 കാലടി ഭൂമീലറക്കുന്നില്ല;  
 “കാപിലെച്ചോത്തോത്തെ കുഞ്ഞിക്കുങ്കി!  
 ഒരിക്കലിപ്പാതില് തുറന്നു തായേ!”

“തച്ചോളൊതേച്ചുകുറപ്പെ! ബന്ധുപാ!  
 പടിഞ്ഞാററാത്താക്കോല് താനേ ഇപ്പം  
 എൻറെ(ക)യിലില്ലാലിതെൻറെ ബന്ധുപാ!”

- 
- |                            |                |
|----------------------------|----------------|
| 1. ബഹുമാനത്തിലുള്ള സഭാംഗന. |                |
| 2. ജാതകം.                  | 3. കുഞ്ഞിച്ചൻ. |
| 4. അവിടെക്കുടിയുള്ള.       | 5. അകത്തു്.    |

“കാവിലെച്ചാത്തോത്തു കഞ്ഞിക്കുങ്കി!  
ഇൻറെ<sup>1</sup> മനത്തെ<sup>2</sup> നൊടുണ്ടായിട്ട്  
ഒരുകിണ്ടിപ്പാലു തരണെന്നിങ്ക്;  
വെള്ളത്തിനും പാരം ഭാവമെന്നിങ്ക്.”

ബന്ധുൻറെ തങ്കടം<sup>3</sup> കേക്കുന്നേരം  
പട്ടാങ്ങാ<sup>4</sup>ന്നോന്തെ കഞ്ഞിക്കുങ്കി,  
ഒരുകിണ്ടിപ്പാലിങ്ങെടുക്കുന്നോള,  
പടിഞ്ഞാറാംവാതില്ക്കക്കൊണ്ടുവന്ന്,  
അരവാതില് പോയിത്തുറന്നോളന്നു.  
ഓളിന്നപ്പാതില് തുറക്കുന്നേരം  
തച്ചോളുല്ലോമനക്കഞ്ഞുതാനേനൻ  
പുഞ്ചിരിക്കൊണ്ടല്ലൊ കഞ്ഞുതാനേനൻ.  
പാലു വാങ്ങുവാനോ കുടിച്ചോളന്നു.  
കാവിലെച്ചാത്തോത്തു കഞ്ഞുവ്വാടി<sup>5</sup>  
മോനെയെടുത്തു മണക്കുന്നല്ലൊ.

“കാവിലെച്ചാത്തോത്തു കഞ്ഞിക്കുങ്കി!  
കരയന് വിളിക്കറെ<sup>6</sup> കഞ്ഞിക്കുങ്കി!  
വേഗംപോയ് വേഗംവരട്ടെ ഞാനേ.”  
പൊട്ടിക്കരഞ്ഞല്ലൊ കഞ്ഞിക്കുങ്കി.  
പിന്നെയും പറയുന്നു കഞ്ഞുതാനേനൻ :—  
“പറഞ്ഞീടെ നിക്ഷപാനോ നേരംപോരാ.  
കരയന് വിളിക്കറെ കഞ്ഞിക്കുങ്കി!  
പോയി വരട്ടെ ഞാൻ കഞ്ഞിക്കുങ്കി!”

അപ്പാച്ചുലാടന്നും<sup>8</sup> പാഞ്ഞോളന്നു.  
ഓനപ്പടിയുള്ളിപ്പായുന്നല്ലൊ.  
ഓപൊന്നെത്തെ<sup>9</sup>പ്പാലം തലക്കെത്തുവ്വം  
പരിച് തൊടക്കൊന്നമറ്ത്ത<sup>10</sup>ല്ലൊ

1. നിൻറെ.

2. മനസ്സ്.

3. സങ്കടം.

4. സത്യം.

5. കരേനൻറെ മകൻ.

6. ഇവിടെ ചുംബിക്കയെന്നർത്ഥമാണ്.

7. കരയുകയും വിളിക്കുകയും അരുതു്.

8. അവിടന്നും.

9. മയ്യഴിക്കടുത്തുള്ള സ്ഥലം.

10. അമത്തു-അടിപ്പു.

പരിചതൊടക്കൊന്നമറക്കുമ്പോ  
 കളി കിടകിട കളുങ്ങിവന്നു.  
 ആളുകളൊന്ന് തിരിഞ്ഞുവന്നു.  
 ചിനംവിട്ടിത്തങ്ങൽ വാഴുന്നോരും  
 തച്ചോളിക്കോമക്കുറപ്പും ആണ്:—  
 “കണ്ടാച്ചെര്യോമനക്കുഞ്ഞിച്ചാപ്പ!  
 പാഞ്ഞുടെ പാഞ്ഞുടെ കണ്ടാച്ചെരി!  
 തെയനൻ പൊന്നിയത്തൈത്തിപ്പോയെ!  
 പൊന്നേയ്തൈപ്പാലം വലിച്ചുകള!”  
 കണ്ടാച്ചെര്യോമനക്കുഞ്ഞിച്ചാപ്പൻ  
 കളരിയകത്തുനും പായുന്നല്ലോ  
 പൊന്നേയ്തൈപ്പാലം വലിച്ചുട്ടല്ലോ.  
 അതുതന്നെ കാണുന്നു കുഞ്ഞുയാതേനൻ;  
 നിലയിന്നൊരന്തമ്മറിഞ്ഞുട്ടല്ലോ;  
 പഴകുന്നക്കര വീണോളുന്നു;  
 ഓനക്കളരിലും തുളളിവീണ.  
 കളരിനടുവിലെ ചെന്തെങ്ങോട്  
 കച്ചില<sup>1</sup>കെട്ടിത്തരിഞ്ഞൊതേനൻ;  
 വലഭാഗം കച്ചില മുറക്കൂട്ടിട്ട്  
 കായം കരിക്കും തെരിപ്പിച്ചല്ലോ.  
 ഇടഭാഗം കച്ചില മുറക്കുയാതേനൻ  
 വരണ്ടതും പഴുത്തതും തെരിപ്പിച്ചല്ലോ.  
 മേപ്പയിലെ തച്ചോളി കുഞ്ഞുയാതേനൻ  
 കതിരുകുരിക്കളം ശിശ്ര(ച്ച)നാറും  
 ഓലപായി<sup>2</sup>ക്കൊണ്ടു പൊയിതൊണ്ടല്ലോ.  
 ഉച്ചതിരിയോളം പൊയിതൊണ്ടിട്ടും  
 ആഴക്കെണ്ണക്കു പണ്ണിങ്ങമില്ല;  
 ആഴക്കെണ്ണക്കു പണ്ണിങ്ങമില്ല.

മനസ്സിലു് നിനക്കുന്നു കുഞ്ഞുയാതേനൻ:—  
 കാവിൽ ഭഗവതി! തമ്പുരാട്ടി!

---

1. കച്ചുളി, കച്ച നല്ലവണ്ണം മുറക്കാനാണ് ഇങ്ങിനെ ചെയ്യുന്നത്.

2. അമ്പലമുടി.

പതിനെട്ടുനാട്ടിലും പോയി ഞാനെ!  
 മാനംകെട്ടു ഞാൻ മടങ്ങിട്ടില്ല!  
 കാവിൽ ഭഗവതി തമ്പുരാട്ടി!  
 ഏന്റെ തൻറുപ്ಪേരിനില്ലെ? <sup>1</sup> ഓളി!  
 ഓനമ്മനത്തില് നിനക്കുമുഖെ  
 ഓനൊരു കയ്യുക്കു വന്നോണ്ടല്ലോ.  
 കതിരൂക്കുരിക്കളും ശിഷ്യന്മാരും  
 മേപ്പയിലെ തച്ചോളെതയനനും  
 ഒപ്പായിക്കൊണ്ടു ഒപ്പായിതൊണ്ടിട്ട്  
 കതിരൂക്കുരിക്കളും ശിഷ്യന്മാരും  
 ഓല് മെയിക്കെ? <sup>2</sup> തളന്നുംപോയി.  
 പൂത്തറക്കും മുട്ടു കുത്തിപ്പോയി.  
 പൂത്തറോടും മുട്ടു ക്കുത്തുനേരം  
 വിളിച്ചു പറയുന്ന കുരുക്കള് താനോ:—

“മേപ്പയിലെ തച്ചോളി കുഞ്ഞൊത്തേന!  
 വെററില മുറുക്കി ഒപ്പായിയോമ്മ്കു”

പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുവുമുട്ടു ചേരുംമുഖെ  
 മേപ്പയിലെ തച്ചോളി കുഞ്ഞൊത്തേനൻ  
 കുരിക്കളെ അട്ടാടത്തളളിയിട്ട്  
 നെത്തത്തു കേറാടിരിക്കുന്നല്ലോ.  
 കതിരൂക്കുരിക്കളെയും ശിഷ്യന്മാരേ-  
 ഓലെ തലയിങ്ങു കൊത്തെട്ടുത്തു,  
 പീച്ചിപ്പരിചയിക്കോരെയടുത്തു,  
 കുരിക്കക്കും കൊണ്ടുപായിട്ടാശകാട്ടി,  
 കൂട്ടുകുക്കും കൊണ്ടുപായിട്ടാശകാട്ടി,  
 മുച്ചായിരം തുപ്പുന്നതുപ്പുണ്ടില്  
 തുപ്പുണ്ടിക്കൊണ്ടുപായിചാടിക്കൊണ്ടെ. <sup>3</sup>  
 ഓലക്കളരീനും പോരുന്നല്ലോ.  
 ആത്തുവിളിച്ചൊണ്ടു പോരുന്നല്ലോ.

1. ഏന്റെതായിട്ടുള്ള ആ പേര് ഇപ്പോഴും ഇല്ലേ? 2. മെയും കയ്യും. 3. ഏറിഞ്ഞു.



കതിരുകുരുന്നെല്ലാമുടക്കി  
കുരുന്നെല്ലാമുടക്കി(രം)പോയി.

അന്നത്തരം നടന്നുട്ടിട്ട്  
പറയുന്നല്ലോമന കുഞ്ഞൊത്തേനൻ:—

“തച്ചോളിക്കോമക്കുറപ്പേൻറട്ട്!  
പച്ചപച്ചച്ചത്തോ! ചങ്ങാതിയേ!  
ഞാനെല്ലാമിന്നു പോരുന്നേരം  
കുട്ടാരംവെച്ചു മറന്നോപയല്ലോ  
ഞാൻ പോയെടുത്തിട്ട് കൊണ്ടുപോട്ടെ.”

തച്ചോളിക്കോമക്കുറപ്പല്ലാൻ  
പറയുന്നല്ലോമനക്കുറപ്പേനൻ:—  
“കുട്ടാരം പോട്ടെൻറ കുഞ്ഞൊത്തേന!  
ഉച്ചതിരിഞ്ഞാലും പൊയ്ക്കിരിഞ്ഞാലും  
പൊന്നുതെ മണ്ണിച്ചുവട്ടുറയല്ലോ.  
ഇങ്ങൊട്ടും പോവല്ലേ കുഞ്ഞൊത്തേന!

ചീനംവീട്ട്ത്തങ്ങു വാഴുന്നോർ  
അതുതന്നെ കേട്ടല്ലോ വാഴുന്നോർ.  
“ഇങ്ങൊട്ടുപൊന്നുതെ പോവണ്ടല്ലോ  
കുട്ടാരങ്ങളെനെ വേണ്ടിക്കിട  
എന്നുട കുട്ടാരം തരുവൻ ഞാനേ.”

പകരം പറഞ്ഞല്ലോ കുഞ്ഞൊത്തേനൻ:—  
“പണ്ടൊരുകാലത്തങ്ങനെ ഇപ്പം  
പൊന്നുതെതന്നെ പടക്കുപായിട്ട്  
കുട്ടാരം ചാട്ടേച്ചു പോയെന്നാൻ  
പേടിച്ചിട്ടിട്ടേച്ചു പോയെന്നാൻ  
കേട്ടാക്കുറവിയ്യേ തെൻറയേട്ട!”

വിലക്കുതവനൊട്ടും കേട്ടില്ലല്ലോ!  
ഓനിപ്പ പൊന്നുതെ ചെല്ലുന്നേരം  
ചുണ്ടങ്ങൊട്ടിച്ചിട്ടുറയൻ ബപ്പൻ  
കണ്ണാലെ കണ്ടല്ലോമനോനാൻ

ഇരട്ടക്കഴലുള്ള തോക്കെടുത്ത്  
 രണ്ടുണ്ട രണ്ടുതരം കാലിട്ട്  
 വരമ്പും തൊളച്ചാട കൂട്ടുന്നല്ലോ.

തച്ചൊളുല്ലോമന ക്കഞ്ഞത്യാതേനൻ  
 കട്ടാരെടുത്ത് മടങ്ങുവാണല്ലോ.  
 പാതിപ്പെരുവഴിക്കെത്തും നേരം  
 വരമ്പുതൊളച്ചു വെടിയും വെച്ചു  
 തച്ചൊളുതച്ചുക്കുറുപ്പിൻറാൺ  
 നെററിത്തടത്തിനുപോയുണ്ടകൊണ്ടു.

അതുതന്നെ കാണുന്നൊരു പുളുളുവനൊ  
 കുറുപ്പിനെ വെടിവെച്ചു പൂലുവനെ  
 പകരമെയിതല്ലൊ പൂളുളുവനൊ.

തച്ചൊളുല്ലോമനക്കഞ്ഞത്യാതേനൻ  
 തലപ്പാവ് വീരാളുഴിച്ചെടുത്ത്,  
 നെറിയടക്കൊരു കെട്ടുംകെട്ടി.  
 ആടന്നും പോന്നല്ലോ കഞ്ഞത്യാതേനൻ.  
 ബോധക്കോലസ്ത്രം വന്നോളുന്നു  
 കച്ചാലേ താങ്ങുന്നു കഞ്ഞിച്ചാപ്പൻ.

തച്ചൊളി കോമക്കുറുപ്പല്ലാൺ  
 അയ്യം നിലവിളി കൂട്ടുന്നല്ലോ.  
 ഓൻറടക്കുട്ടുള്ള മുച്ചായിരം  
 അയ്യം നിലവിളി കൂട്ടുന്നല്ലോ.

പറയുന്നണ്ടാമന ക്കഞ്ഞത്യാതേനൻ:—  
 “ഏൻറടക്കുട്ടുള്ള മുച്ചായിരെ!  
 അയ്യം നിലവിളി കൂട്ടുന്നല്ലോ.  
 മാനത്തിന് പൊന്നുത്തൊഴിഞ്ഞു ഞാനേ!  
 മാനംകെട്ടും ഞാനത് വീണിട്ടില്ലാ.  
 ഒന്നുണ്ട കേക്കുപണ്ടു ഏൻറ ഏട്ട!  
 ആരുമൊരുത്തരും കരയേണ്ടേലോ !

തച്ചോളി കോമക്കുറുപ്പേൻറട്ട്!  
 എനിക്കു ചിലത് പറയാനുണ്ട്.  
 കാവിലെ ചാത്തോത്തു ക്കിടന്നാൻ  
 ആരും സഖിയില്ലവക്കേൻറട്ട്!  
 ഞാനെന്നതുള്ള സഖിയേ ഉള്ളു.  
 പെരിയക്കുക്കണ്ടം കൊടുക്കറോക്കു്.  
 ഓളു് പണിയങ്ങെടുക്കുന്നേരം  
 എന്നെപ്പോലത്തോലു് പോന്നേരത്തു്  
 ഉടുത്തോരുടുത്തുണ്ടു് താത്തേപല്ലേല്ലോ.  
 എന്നെ നിനച്ചു കരയും ക്കി.  
 അട്ടയുള്ള കണ്ടം കൊടുക്കറേട്ട്!  
 അട്ട പറച്ചട്ട ചാടുനേരം  
 എന്നെ നിനച്ചു കരയും ഓളു്.  
 തോടനും ബാലിയും രണ്ടു കണ്ടം  
 ക്കിക്കുതന്നെ കൊടുക്കേൻറട്ട്!  
 എൻറടെ ചാപ്പനങ്ങാണേ ഏട്ട്!  
 എന്നെ നിനക്കും പകരമാണു്.  
 ചാപ്പനെ നിനച്ചോളണെൻറ ഏട്ട്!  
 എന്നെ വെടിവെച്ചു പൂലുവനെ  
 പകരം വെടിവെച്ചു പുള്ളുവനു്  
 ഓൻ അങ്ങോൻറ കുടുംബത്തിനും  
 നാനായിപ്പാടു<sup>1</sup> കൊടുക്കണേട്ട്!  
 പോയെന്നും പോയിക്കോന്നാടുന്റോലു്  
 ഓലെ അടുത്തു വിളിച്ചു ഞാനെ  
 ഞാനില്ലാത്തുള്ള വ്യസനമാണു്  
 ഓലേ അറിയിക്കറെൻറ ഏട്ട്!"

പൊട്ടിക്കരയുന്ന കുറുപ്പല്ലാണു്  
 "എന്തിനു കരയുന്നതെൻറ ഏട്ട്!  
 നെററിത്തടത്തിനൊരുണ്ടുകൊണ്ടാൽ  
 കരണതെരമ്പിനു രണ്ടുമ്പൊണ്ടാലും  
 പണ്ടാരാൻ ചത്തിട്ടുണ്ടോ ഏട്ട്!"

തച്ചോളി കോമക്കുറപ്പല്ലാൺ  
 കമ്പകലുക്കിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നല്ലോ.  
 കൂടെ ചിരിച്ചല്ലോ കഞ്ഞയാതേനൻ.

“തച്ചോളി കോമക്കുറപ്പേൻറട്ട!  
 നെററിത്തടത്തിനൊരുണ്ടൊണ്ടിട്ടും  
 കരണത്തരമ്പിനു രണ്ടമ്പൊണ്ടിട്ടും  
 പണ്ടാരാൻ ചേയിച്ചോ<sup>1</sup>ലുണ്ടോൻറട്ട!”

പൊട്ടിക്കരഞ്ഞു കുറപ്പല്ലാൺ  
 പിന്നേയും പറയുന്നു കഞ്ഞയാതേനൻ:—  
 “മേപ്പയിലെ തച്ചോളയാതേനെൻറ ഏട്ട!  
 ഞാനിന്ന് പൊന്നിയത്തൊഴിയു<sup>2</sup>മല്ലോ  
 ഞാനിന്നപ്പൊന്നുത്തൊഴിഞ്ഞൊണ്ടാല്  
 പിള്ളർകളിലും സ<sup>3</sup>യാട്ടിലും  
 ഏട്ടൻ കുറപ്പൊട്ടും പോവറ്<sup>4</sup>തല്ലോ.  
 അത് കേക്കാണ്ടേട്ടനത് പോയെങ്കിലു<sup>5</sup>  
 മാനംകെട്ടേട്ടൻ മടങ്ങേപല്ലുള്ള.  
 പറഞ്ഞും പറഞ്ഞും തകമുട്ടല്ലോ;<sup>6</sup>  
 കണ്ണുമടഞ്ഞു കയിമലൻ;  
 മേപ്പയിലെ തച്ചോളി കഞ്ഞയാതേനൻ  
 തെയനൻ പൊന്നുത്തൊഴിഞ്ഞൊണ്ടല്ലോ.

അടുക്കൂട്ടുള്ളൊരു മുപ്പായിരം  
 നെഞ്ഞത്തടിച്ചുള്ള മൊറ മൊറയും  
 കരഞ്ഞു വിളിച്ചല്ലേ പോരുന്നതു്.

1. ശേഷിക്ക—ചാവത്തിരിക്കുക.

2. മരിക്ക എന്നതിനുള്ള ഭേദം.

3. അവസാനിച്ചു.



## NOTE

In this article Mr. P. Krishnan Nayar examines the view that the Kārika and Vrtti of Dhvanyālōka are by different authors and concludes that both are by the same author, *viz.*, Ānandavardhanācārya citing evidence from standard works like Lōcana, Abhinava Bhārati, Vyaktivivēka and Kāvya-mīmamsa, etc.



# ധന്യാലോകകർതൃകൃ.

By

P. KRISHNAN NAIR, SIROMANI,  
*Junior Lecturer in Malayalam.*

ധന്യാലോകമെന്ന ധനിപ്രതിപാദനഗ്രന്ഥത്തിൽ സൂത്രം പോലെ ബഹുപദസംഗ്രഹരൂപമായ കാരിക, അതിന്റെ സകല സാരവിവരണരൂപമായ വൃത്തി എന്നീ രണ്ടു തരത്തിലുള്ള നിബന്ധനങ്ങളാണല്ലോ അടങ്ങിയിരിക്കുന്നത്. അതിൽ വൃത്തിഗ്രന്ഥമായ 'ആലോകം' മാത്രം ആനന്ദവൽനാചാർയ്യരുടേയും 'ധനി'യെന്ന കാരികാഗ്രന്ഥം ആനന്ദവൽനാരു മുപ്പുള്ള മറ്റേതോ ഒരു ആചാർയ്യന്റേയുമാണെന്നു ചിലർ അഭിപ്രായപ്പെട്ടു കാണുന്നു. അതിലേക്ക് അവർക്കുള്ള ആധാരം, അഭിനവതൃപ്താചാർയ്യർ ധന്യാലോകവ്യാഖ്യാനമായ ലോചനത്തിൽ പല സ്ഥലത്തും കാരികാകാരനും വൃത്തികാരനും രണ്ടാണെന്ന നിലയിൽ നിദ്ദേശിച്ചു കാണുന്നതാണ്. ധന്യാലോകലോചനത്തിലെ 1, 12, 59, 60, 122, 123 എന്നീ ഭാഗങ്ങൾ നോക്കുക. ആ വക പംക്തികളിൽ പ്രധാനമായിട്ടുള്ളത്,—

<sup>1</sup> “അത ഏവ മൂലകാരികാ തന്നിരാകരണാത്മാ ന ശ്രൂയതേ. വൃത്തികൃത്തു നിരാകൃതമപി പ്രമേയശ്ചാപൂരണായ കണ്ഠേന തൽപക്ഷ മന്ത്രേ നിരാകരോതി.” ഉദ്യോതം 1. ഭാഗം 59.

<sup>2</sup> “തേനാത്ര പ്രഥമോദ്യോതേ ധനേ സാമാന്യലക്ഷണമേവ കാരികാകാരേണ കൃതം. ഭിതീയോദ്യോതേതേ കാരികാകാരോവാന്തര വിഭാഗം വിശേഷലക്ഷണഞ്ച വിഭവഭൂതവാദമുഖേന മൂലവിഭാഗം ഭിവിധം സൂചിതവാൻ. തദാശ്യാനസാരേണ തു വൃത്തികൃതൈര്യോദ്യോതേ മൂലവിഭാഗമവോചത്.” (പ്രഥമോദ്യോതം, ഭാഗം 59.)

1. അതുകൊണ്ടു തന്നെയാണ് തന്നിരാകരണത്തിനായി മൂലകാരികയില്ലാത്തത്. വൃത്തികാരനാകട്ടെ, നിരസിക്കപ്പെട്ടിരിക്കിലും പ്രമേയസന്നിവേശപരിപൂർത്തിക്കായി ആക്ഷേപം മുക്തകണ്ഠം അനുവദിച്ചു നിരസിക്കുന്നു.

2. അതിനാൽ സാമാന്യവിശേഷലക്ഷണങ്ങളിൽ ധനിയുടെ സാമാന്യലക്ഷണം മാത്രം കാരികാകാരൻ പ്രഥമോദ്യോതത്തിൽ നിർമ്മിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു. ഭിതീയോദ്യോതത്തിലാകട്ടെ അവാന്തരവിഭാഗവും വിശേഷലക്ഷണവും പ്രദർശിപ്പിക്കുന്ന കാരികാകാരൻ അനുവാദം വഴിക്കു മൂലവിഭാഗം ഭിവിധമാണെന്നു സൂചിപ്പിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു.



<sup>1</sup> “ന ചൈതന്മയോൽസൂത്രമുക്തം \* അപി തു കാരികാകാ  
രാഭിപ്രായേണാത്യാഹം.” ഭിതീയോദ്യോതം, ഭാഗം 60.

<sup>2</sup> “ഭവതി മൂലതോ ഭിഭേദേതം കാരികാകാരസ്വാപി സമ്മത  
മേവേതി ഭാവഃ” ഭിതീയോദ്യോതം, ഭാഗം 60.

<sup>3</sup> “ഏതത്താവത്രിഭേദേതം ന കാരികാകാരേണ കൃതം. വൃത്തി  
കാരേണ തു ഭംഗിതം.” തൃതീയോദ്യോതം, ഭാഗം 123.

ലോചനകാരന്റെ ഈ വാക്യങ്ങൾ കാരികാകാരനും വൃത്തി  
കാരനും ഒരാളല്ല രണ്ടുപേർ തന്നെയാണെന്നു തോന്നിപ്പിടുന്നതു തര  
ത്തിലുള്ളതാണെന്നു സമ്മതിക്കാം. എന്നാൽ, ഈ തോന്നലിന്—  
ഈ തെറ്റിലാണയ്ക്കു—ദൃഢതയും ശക്തിയും പ്രാചീനന്മാരായ ഭാര  
തീയശാസ്ത്രകാരന്മാരുടെ പ്രവചനസമ്പ്രദായം ഗ്രഹിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളവരുടെ  
വിഷയത്തിൽ ഉണ്ടാവാൻ പ്രയാസമാണെന്നാണ് എനിക്കു തോന്നു  
ന്നതു്. ശാസ്ത്രകാരന്മാർ തങ്ങളുടെ സൂത്രഗ്രന്ഥങ്ങൾക്കും സൂത്രസ്ഥാനീ  
യങ്ങളായ കാരികാഗ്രന്ഥങ്ങൾക്കും വിവരണരൂപങ്ങളായ വൃത്തികളും  
ഭാഷ്യങ്ങളും നിർമ്മിക്കയും അങ്ങിനെ നിർമ്മിക്കപ്പെടുന്ന വൃത്താഭിഗ്രന്ഥ  
ങ്ങളിൽ “ഇതി കൌടല്യഃ” “ഇതി യായാവരീയഃ” എന്നിങ്ങിനെ തങ്ങളു  
ടെ പ്രഥമപര്യായരൂപത്തിൽ നിദ്ദേശിക്കുകയും പതിവാകുന്നു. മംബു  
കന്റെ ‘അലങ്കാരസമുത്സവ’ത്തിൽ തന്റെ ഗ്രന്ഥത്തെ ഉദ്ദേശിച്ചു്  
“ഉദാഹരണം യഥാ മംബുകീയേ ശ്രീകണ്ഠസ്തവേ” എന്നും അഭിനവ  
ഗുപ്തൻ തന്നെ തന്റെ നാട്യശാസ്ത്രപുഷ്പാഞ്ചനമായ ‘അഭിനവഭാരതി’  
യിൽ “തദസമഞ്ജസമിത്വഭിനവഗുപ്താചാര്യഃ” എന്നും പറഞ്ഞിരി  
ക്കുന്നതു നോക്കുക. അത്രമാത്രമല്ല, സൂത്രകാരപവൃത്തികാരതാല്പര്യ  
പാധിഭേദത്താൽ ആത്മാവിൽ ഭേദമാരോപിച്ചു വ്യവഹരിക്കുകയും  
സാധാരണമാണ്. ഉദാഹരണമായി “ഗ്രന്ഥാരംഭേ ശിഷ്ടസമയപരി  
പാലനായ ശാസ്ത്രകാരഃ സമുചിതേഷ്ടഭേദവതാം പ്രണിധത്തേ” എന്ന

1. ഇതു ഞാൻ സൂത്രത്തെ അതിക്രമിച്ചു പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുള്ളതല്ല. പിന്നെയോ?  
കാരികാകാരന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം അനുസരിച്ചു തന്നെയാണ്. എന്നു പറയുന്നു—

\* ‘ന ചൈതന്മയോക്തം’ എന്നതു് അപവാദമാണ്.

2. മെഴികുറിയ ഭേദഭേദവിധി കാരികാകാരനും സമ്മതംതന്നെ എന്ന്  
ഭാവം.

3. ഈ ഭേദഭേദവിധി കാരികാകാരൻ കാണിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതല്ല; വൃത്തികാരൻ  
കാണിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതാണ്.

‘കാവ്യാനുശാസനസൂത്രഗ്രന്ഥ’ത്തിലെ മംഗളപദ്യത്തിന്റെ അവതാരികതന്നെയെടുക്കാം. വൃത്തിഗ്രന്ഥസംബന്ധിയായ മംഗളപദ്യം നിബന്ധിച്ചതിനു ശേഷം സൂത്രഗ്രന്ഥമംഗളപദ്യത്തെ അവതരിപ്പിക്കുന്ന വൃത്തിവാക്യത്തിലുള്ള ‘ശാസ്ത്രകാര’പദത്തിലെ ശാസ്ത്രപദംകൊണ്ട് ‘കാവ്യാനുശാസന’മെന്ന സൂത്രഗ്രന്ഥത്തെയാണ് ഉദ്ദേശിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നത്, ‘കാവ്യാലങ്കാരമൃഡാമണി’യെന്ന വൃത്തിഗ്രന്ഥത്തെയല്ല എന്നതു വ്യക്തമാണല്ലോ. രണ്ടുകൂടി ഒരേഗ്രന്ഥമായി സ്വീകരിക്കുന്ന പക്ഷം “ഗ്രന്ഥാരംഭേ” എന്നു പറഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്നത് തന്നെ യുക്തമല്ലെന്നുവരും.

“പ്രണമ്യ പരമാത്മാനം നിജം കാവ്യാനുശാസനം

ആചാര്യമേമചന്ദ്രേണ വിഭപൽപീതൈ പ്രതന്യതേ.”

എന്നിങ്ങിനെ വൃത്തിഗ്രന്ഥത്തിന്റെ നിർദ്ദിഷ്ടപരിസമാപ്തിക്കായി മംഗളാചരണവും പ്രേക്ഷാവൽപ്രവൃത്തിക്കായി പ്രയോജനപ്രതിപാദനവും നിർവ്വഹിച്ചുകൊണ്ട് അവതാരികാത്മകമായ വൃത്തിഗ്രന്ഥവാക്യത്തിനു ശേഷം നിബന്ധിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന മംഗളാചരണം എങ്ങിനെയാണ് ഗ്രന്ഥാരംഭത്തിലാവുക? വിശേഷിച്ചു, സൂത്രഗ്രന്ഥത്തിന്റെ പേർ ‘കാവ്യാനുശാസന’മെന്നും വൃത്തിഗ്രന്ഥത്തിന്റേതു് ‘കാവ്യാലങ്കാരമൃഡാമണി’യെന്നുമാകുന്നു. ‘മൃഡാമണി’യിലെ പ്രസ്തുതവാക്യമാകട്ടെ ‘കാവ്യാനുശാസന’ത്തിലെ മംഗളശ്ലോകത്തിനുള്ള അവതാരികയുമാണ്. ഈ സ്ഥിതിക്ക്, ‘ശാസ്ത്രകാര’ എന്ന പദം പ്രകൃതത്തിൽ “സൂത്രകാര” “കാവ്യാനുശാസനകാര” എന്നിവയ്ക്കു പര്യായമായിട്ടാണ് പ്രയോഗിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതെന്നുള്ളതു നിസ്സംശയമാണ്. ഇങ്ങിനെ ‘വൃത്തി’യിൽ പ്രവർത്തിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന ഒരാൾ, താൻ തന്നെ നിർമ്മിച്ച ‘സൂത്രരൂപശാസ്ത്ര’ത്തെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു വല്ലതും പറയേണ്ടിവരുമ്പോൾ അത്തരം ഉപാധിഭേദം അവലംബിച്ചു സൂത്രകാരനെന്നോ ശാസ്ത്രകാരനെന്നോ വ്യക്തിഭേദം കല്പിച്ചുകൊണ്ട് ആത്മാവിനെ നിദ്ദേശിക്കുന്ന സ്ഥിതിക്കു വൃത്തിയുടെ പ്യാഖ്യാതത്വം അതതു് ഉപാധിയെ പുറസ്തരിച്ചു് ഒരേ വ്യക്തിയെത്തന്നെ സൂത്രകാരനെന്നും വൃത്തികാരനെന്നും കാര്യവശാൽ യഥാസൗകര്യം വ്യവഹരിക്കുന്നതു ന്യായമെന്നായല്ലേ? ഇത്രമാത്രമേ ലോചനക്കാരനും ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ളു.

വിശേഷിച്ചു, പ്രകൃതത്തിൽ പ്രധാനമായ മറ്റൊരു വസ്തുത കൂടി ഗ്രഹിക്കേണ്ടതായിട്ടുണ്ട്. അതു വൃത്തിയുടെ സ്വരൂപവും അതിനു

മൂലത്തോടുള്ള കൂടമയും തന്നെ. 'സൂത്രജ്ഞരേക്കോ സൂത്രസ്ഥാനീയങ്ങളായ കാരികകൾക്കോ ഉള്ള പദപദാത്മവിവേകം മാത്രം യാതൊന്നിൽ വർത്തിക്കുന്നുവോ അത് 'വൃത്തി' എന്ന പൂർവ്വപത്തിപ്രകാരം 'വൃത്' ധാതുവിന്ന് "സ്രിയാം ക്തിൻ" എന്ന സൂത്രത്താൽ അധികരണാത്മത്തിൽ 'ക്തിൻ' പ്രത്യയം വന്നു നിഷ്പന്നമായ ശബ്ദമാണ് 'വൃത്തി' എന്നത്. അതുകൊണ്ട്, മൂലത്തിൽ പറയുകയോ സൂചിപ്പിക്കുകയോ ചെയ്തിട്ടില്ലാത്ത കാര്യത്തെ വൃത്തിയിൽ വിവരിച്ചുകൂടേണ്ടെന്നും അങ്ങിനെ ചെയ്യുന്നത് വൃത്തിധർമ്മത്തെ ഉല്പാദിക്കയാണെന്നും സിദ്ധിക്കുന്നു. "വർത്തതേസ്യാം സൂത്രാണാം യഥാവൽ പദപദാത്മവിവേക ഇതി വൃത്തിഃ. അധികരണാത്മം ക്തിൻപ്രത്യയഃ. വൃത്തിലക്ഷണമുക്തം ഭാമഹേന \* സൂത്രമാത്രസ്യ യാ വ്യാഖ്യാസാ വൃത്തിരഭിധീയതേ ഇതി" എന്നു കാവ്യാലങ്കാരസൂത്രവൃത്തിയുടെ വ്യാഖ്യാനമായ 'കാമധേനു'വിൽ ഗോപേന്ദ്രതിപ്പഭൂപലനം "സൂത്രാണാം സകലസാരവിവരണം വൃത്തിഃ" എന്നു 'കാവ്യമീമാംസ'യിൽ രാജശേഖരനും പറഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്നതു നോക്കുക. ഇങ്ങിനെയിരിക്കെ, കാരികാരൂപമായ മൂലത്തിൽ സൂചിപ്പിക്കുവോലും ചെയ്യാത്ത കാര്യം വൃത്തിയിലില്ലെന്നു--പ്രകാരാന്തരത്തിൽ പറയുന്നതായാൽ, കാരികാകാരണം അനഭിപ്രേതമായ അംശം വൃത്തികാരൻ ഉപന്യസിച്ചിട്ടില്ലെന്നു— പ്രതിപാദിക്കേണ്ടതു വ്യാഖ്യാതാവായ ലോചനകാരന്റെ ചുമതലയാണെന്നതിൽ വല്ല സംശയവുമുണ്ടോ?

ഈ കൃത്യം തന്നെയാണ് മുമ്പുദ്ധരിച്ച 59-60 എന്നീ ഭാഗങ്ങളിലെ പംക്തികളെക്കൊണ്ടു തന്റെ വ്യാഖ്യാനത്തിൽ ലോചനകാരൻ നിവ്വഹിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നത്. 123-ാംഭാഗത്തിൽനിന്ന് ഉദ്ധരിച്ചു കാണിച്ച ലോചനപംക്തികളാകട്ടെ, തൃതീയോദ്യോതത്തിലെ "അവിവക്ഷിതവാചസ്യ—" എന്ന കാരികയുടെ അവതാരികയായി "വ്യാഖ്യാനമുഖേനൈവ ധ്വനേഃ പ്രദർശിതേ സപ്രഭേദേ സ്വരൂപേ പുനർവ്യാഖ്യാനമുഖേനൈവ പ്രകാശ്യതേ" എന്ന വൃത്തിയിലെ "വ്യാഖ്യാനമുഖേന" എന്നതിന്റെ "വ്യാഖ്യാനം=വസ്തുപലങ്കാരരസാനാം മുഖേന" എന്ന പൂർവ്വവ്യാഖ്യാനത്തെ ഖണ്ഡിക്കുന്ന സന്ദർഭത്തിലുള്ളതാണ്. ആ വ്യാഖ്യാനപ്രകാരം സിദ്ധിക്കുന്ന അർത്ഥം, മുമ്പു ദ്വിതീയോദ്യോതത്തിൽ കാരികാ

ഗ്രന്ഥത്തിൽ നിദ്ദേശിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന ധ്വനിഭേദം വസ്തുപരമായതല്ലെന്നു സാക്ഷ്യം നൽകുന്നതായ വ്യംഗ്യപ്രഭേദത്തെ ആശ്രയിച്ചുകൊണ്ടാകുന്നുവെന്നാണല്ലോ. കാരികയിൽ അത്തരം വ്യംഗ്യപ്രഭേദം നിദ്ദേശിച്ചിട്ടില്ലാത്തതിനാൽ അതെങ്ങിനെ യുക്തമാകും എന്ന അഭിപ്രായത്തിന്മേൽ അയ്യങ്കുരുത്തിയുടെ വ്യക്തതയ്ക്കുവേണ്ടി സൂത്രകാരന്മാർ വൃത്തികാരന്മാർ എന്നീ ഉപാധിഭേദങ്ങൾ വ്യക്തിഭേദം കല്പിച്ചുകൊണ്ട്, താദൃശ്യവ്യംഗ്യപ്രഭേദം വൃത്തികാരന്മാരെ സൂത്രകാരൻ നിദ്ദേശിച്ചിട്ടില്ല എന്നിങ്ങനെ ഉപന്യസിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നുവെന്നുവരുമല്ലോ. ഇങ്ങിനെയിരിക്കെ, സൗകര്യം പരസ്സരിച്ച സൂത്രകാരന്മാർക്കിടയിൽ കല്പിക്കപ്പെട്ടിരിക്കുന്ന കർത്തൃഭേദത്തെ വാസ്തവികമായി ഗ്രഹിക്കുന്നത് എത്രത്തോളം യുക്തമായിരിക്കും? ആകയാൽ, “സമസ്തവസ്തുവിഷയം ഏതൊരു ആരോപിതാ യഃ” എന്ന സ്വന്തം കാരകയുടെ വൃത്തിയിൽ മുമ്പാകെ “ആരോപിതാ ഇതി ബഹു വചനമവിവക്ഷിതം” എന്നു ഉപന്യസിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതിനെ കർത്തൃഭേദ സാധകമായി തെറ്റിദ്ധരിച്ചുകൊണ്ട് കാവ്യപ്രകാശത്തിലെ വൃത്തിഗ്രന്ഥം മാത്രമാണ് മുമ്പാകെത്തന്നെ കാരകഗ്രന്ഥം \* അഗ്നിപുരാണത്തിൽനിന്നു സംഗ്രഹിച്ച ഭരതമഷ്ടി രചിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതാണെന്നും ‘ആദർശ’മെന്ന വ്യാഖ്യാനത്തിൽ മഹേശ്വരൻ അഭിപ്രായപ്പെട്ടിരിക്കുന്നതുപോലെ ഈ അഭിപ്രായവും മേയമാണെന്നു സപ്രശ്നം പ്രസ്താവിക്കേണ്ടിയിരിക്കുന്നു.

എന്നാൽ, കാവ്യപ്രകാശത്തിലെ വൃത്തിയിലല്ലാതെ കാരകഗ്രന്ഥത്തിൽ മാത്രമേയെപ്പറ്റി പറയാതിരിക്കെ, രൂപകപ്രകരണത്തിലെ “മാലാതു പൂർവ്വവൽ” (‘മാല’ മുന്പുവരിച്ചുപോലെ) എന്ന കാരകാഭാഗം കാരകയും വൃത്തിയും ഒരാളുടേതാണെന്നതിലേക്കു തെളിവുകയാൽ മഹേശ്വരഭിപ്രായം മേയമാണെന്നു സമ്മതിക്കാം. അതുപോലെ പ്രകൃതത്തിൽ ആദ്യന്തരമായ തെളിവെന്താണുള്ളത്? ‘പ്രഥമകാരികയിലെ “സഹൃദയമനു പ്രീതയേ” എന്ന അംശത്തിന്റെ വിവരണമായ “സഹൃദയാനാം ആനന്ദോ മനസി ലഭതാം പ്രതിഷ്ഠാമിതി” എന്ന വൃത്തിഗ്രന്ഥത്തിലെ ആനന്ദശബ്ദത്തെ സംബന്ധിച്ച്,

\* അഗ്നിപുരാണത്തിലെ അലങ്കാരസന്ദർഭം ഭോജരാജനു ശേഷം ആരോ അതുവരെയുള്ള അലങ്കാരഗ്രന്ഥങ്ങളെ അവലംബിച്ചു നിർമ്മിച്ച ചേർത്തിട്ടുള്ളതാണെന്നും നിർമ്മാതാവിന്നു സ്വന്തമായി ഒരു അഭിപ്രായമില്ലെന്നും കാവ്യജീവിതവൃത്തിയുടെ ഉപോദ്ഘാതത്തിൽ തെളിയിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതു നോക്കുക.

“ആനന്ദ ഇതി പ ഗ്രന്ഥകൃതോ നാമ. തേന സ ഏവ ആനന്ദവർണാ ചാർച്ച ഏതർഹാസ്രഭാരണ സഹൃദയഹൃദയേഷു പ്രതിഷ്ഠാം ഭവായത നാഭിവരണശ്ചരീം സ്ഥിതിം ഗച്ഛതു ഇതി ഭാവഃ” എന്നിങ്ങിനെ ലോചന കാരൻ വ്യാഖ്യാനിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നത് കർത്തൃഭേദത്തിൽ അനുപപന്നമാകുന്നതിനാൽ അതുതന്നെ പ്രമാണം എന്നിത്തരത്തിലുള്ള വാദമാകട്ടെ തീരേ ബലം ബജമാണെന്നു മോർമ്മിക്കണം. ലോചനകാരന്റെ പ്രകൃത വ്യാഖ്യാനം അന്യഥാ ഉപപന്നംതന്നെയാണു്; അനുപപന്നമല്ല. അത്രയുമല്ല, നേരേമറിച്ചു കർത്തൃഭേദത്തിന്നുതന്നെയാണതു സാധകം. ആനന്ദവർണാചാർച്ചപരമായ അർത്ഥത്തെ ‘ആനന്ദ’ശബ്ദം ബോധിപ്പിക്കുന്നത് വ്യാഖ്യാനമർത്യാഭയാലാണു്, വാച്യമർത്യാഭയാലല്ല. അതിനാൽ, ആ അർത്ഥം ശബ്ദശക്തിമൂലധനമായാണു് ‘മനഃപ്രീതി’യുടെ വിവരണമായി ആനന്ദശബ്ദമല്ലാതെ ആഹ്ലാദശബ്ദമോ മറ്റോ ആണു് വൃത്തികാരൻ പ്രയോഗിച്ചിരുന്നതെങ്കിൽ താദൃശാർത്ഥസ്പഷ്ടതയ്ക്കിടയിലോ അവകാശം? അതുകൊണ്ടു്, കാരികാഗ്രന്ഥത്തിന്നു വൃത്തി നിർമ്മിക്കുന്നത് ആനന്ദ വർണനായ തനിക്ക് സഹൃദയഹൃദയത്തിൽ സുപ്രതിഷ്ഠ ലഭിക്കുവാനാണെന്ന സാദൃശ്യപ്രായത്തെയോണു് മൂലത്തിലെ ‘മനഃപ്രീതി’ പദത്തിന്നു വ്യാഖ്യാനമായി സഹൃദയശബ്ദം പ്രയോഗിച്ചു വ്യാഖ്യാനിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നത്. ഈ സ്ഥിതിക്കു്, ലോചനകാരന്റെ വ്യാഖ്യാനം കർത്തൃഭേദത്തിൽ ഉപപന്നമല്ലെന്നു് ഞങ്ങളുടെ പരയും? വിശേഷിച്ചു പ്രതിഷ്ഠാഭിലാഷം വൃത്തികാരന്റെതന്നെയാണു്. അതുകൊണ്ടാണു് അതിനെ വാച്യമർത്യാഭയിൽ നിർദ്ദേശിക്കാതെ വ്യാഖ്യാനമാക്കിയതു്. നേരേമറിച്ചു്, കാരികാകാരനു് അത്തരം അഭിപ്രായം ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കയും കാരികാകാരന്റെ നാമധേയം ആനന്ദപദഘടിതമായിരിക്കയും ചെയ്തിരുന്നുവെങ്കിൽ, കാരികയിൽത്തന്നെ ‘മനഃപ്രീതി’ ശബ്ദത്തിന്നു പകരം ‘ആനന്ദ’ശബ്ദം പ്രയോഗിക്കുമായിരുന്നു; അതാണു് ചിന്തയും. കാരികയിലാണു് പ്രയോഗിച്ചിരുന്നതെങ്കിൽ കാരികാകാരന്റെ പേരാണു് ആനന്ദവർണൻ എന്നതു്, വൃത്തികാരൻ വേറെ ഏതോ ഒരാളാണു് എന്നു് അപ്ലോഴം ആക്ഷേപിക്കാനിടയുള്ളതുകൊണ്ടു് അശോകവനികാന്ത്യായപ്രകാരം വൃത്തിയിൽ പറഞ്ഞുവെന്നേയുള്ളൂ എന്നു സമാധാനവും സ്ഥിരീകാരമല്ല. വൃത്തിഗ്രന്ഥത്തിന്റെ അവസാനത്തിൽ,

“സൽകാവ്യതത്ത്വവിഷയം സ്മരിതപ്രസുഷ്ക-  
കല്പം മനസ്സു പരിപക്വധിയാം യദാസീത്

തദ്വ്യാകരോത്സഹദയോദയലാഭമേതോ-  
രാന്നന്ദവർദ്ധന ഇതി പ്രഥിതാഭിധാനഃ.”

എന്നു പറഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു വൃത്തികാരന്റെ നാമധേയം ആനന്ദ വർദ്ധനെന്നാണെന്നുള്ളതിൽ സംശയത്തിനിടയില്ലല്ലോ. ഈ സ്ഥിതിക്കു്, കാരികാകാരന്റെ നാമധേയം ‘ആനന്ദ’ശബ്ദഘടിതമായിരുന്നുവെങ്കിൽ നിശ്ചയമായും “കാവ്യസ്യാത്മാ—” എന്ന കാരികയുടെ ഉത്തരാർദ്ധത്തെ,

“കേചിദാചാം സ്ഥിതമവിഷയേ പ്രോചുരസ്താൽ സ്വരൂപം  
തസ്യ ബ്രഹ്മസ്പൃഹദയമനസ്സീതി ചാനന്ദസിദ്ധൈഃ.”

എന്നീ വിധത്തിലോ മറ്റോ ‘ആനന്ദ’ശബ്ദത്തോടു കൂടി നിബന്ധിക്കാനാണവകാശമുള്ളതു്. അതാണല്ലോ യുക്തവും. ആകയാൽ, വൃത്തിയിലെ ‘ആനന്ദ’ശബ്ദപ്രയോഗം കർത്തൃഭേദത്തിന്നാണു് സാധകമായിരിക്കുന്നതു്. അതുകൊണ്ടു്, ഉപരിപ്രവഞ്ചലികളായ ചിലരുടെ ഇത്തരം വാദം കാര്യ്കാരിയല്ലെന്നും അതിലേക്കു വേറെ തെളിവു വേണ്ടിയിരിക്കുന്നുവെന്നും ശരിക്കുവെങ്കിൽ അതിനുള്ള സമാധാനം, അതും ഒർല്ലഭമല്ലെന്നതെന്നയാണു്.

ധ്വനിസ്വരൂപനിർവ്വചനത്തിന്നൊരുങ്ങിയ കാരികാകാരൻ “കാവ്യസ്യാത്മാ—” എന്ന കാരികയിൽ നിർദ്ദേശിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള പ്രതിപക്ഷികളുടെ ധ്വന്യാഭാവവാദം, ഭാക്തവാദം, അനുഭവ്യയവാദം എന്നീ മൂന്നു പക്ഷങ്ങളിൽ ആദ്യത്തെ രണ്ടു പക്ഷങ്ങളെ മാത്രമേ കാരികാഗ്രന്ഥത്തിൽ വിസ്തരിച്ചു ഖണ്ഡിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളു; മൂന്നാമത്തെ പക്ഷത്തെ പറ്റി ശബ്ദിച്ചിട്ടേയില്ല. അതിനെ വൃത്തിയിലാണു് ഖണ്ഡിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതു്. കാരികാകാരനും വൃത്തികാരനും ഒരാളല്ലെങ്കിൽ അങ്ങിനെ ചെയ്യുമോ? ചെയ്യുന്നതിൽ ന്യായമുണ്ടോ? അഭാവവാദത്തേയും ഭാക്തവാദത്തേയും നിരാകരിച്ചതുകൊണ്ടോ ധ്വനിക്കു സാമാന്യലക്ഷണം നിർദ്ദേശിച്ചതുകൊണ്ടോ അനുഭവ്യയവാദം നിരാകൃതമോ നിരാകൃതപ്രായമോ ആകുകൊണ്ടാണു് പ്രത്യേകിച്ചു കാരികയിൽ നിരാകരിക്കാതിരുന്നതെങ്കിൽ വൃത്തികാർന്നെന്തിനു് ആ പക്ഷത്തെ മുക്തകണ്ഠമനുവർത്തിച്ചു ഖണ്ഡിക്കുന്നു? പ്രമേയശബ്ദാപൂരണത്തിന്നാണെങ്കിൽ താദൃശപൂരണം കാരികാകാരനുമാത്രം എന്തുകൊണ്ടു വേണ്ടു? വിശേഷിച്ചു് പ്രമേയപരിഗണനം കാരികാകാരോപജ്ഞമാണല്ലോ. അതിനാൽ

ലോചനകാരന്റെ പ്രകൃതവിഷയത്തിലുള്ള സമാധാനം വൃത്തിസ്വഭാവ പരിരക്ഷണസംരഭമുപകമായ പ്രൗഢിവാദം മാത്രമാകയാൽ കാൽ മായെടുക്കുവാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ല. അനാഖ്യേയവാദം കാരികയിൽ നിർദ്ദേശിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന സ്ഥിതിക്ക്, 'ഇത്രയുംകൊണ്ട്' അനാഖ്യേയവാദവും നിരസ്തമാ'യെന്നെങ്കിലും പറയാതെ മൗനം ഭജിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതു കാരികാ വൃത്തികളുടെ കർത്തൃകൃത്തിലല്ലാതെ കർത്തൃഭേദത്തിൽ ഒന്നുകൊണ്ടും ഉപപന്നമാവുകയില്ല. കാരികയും വൃത്തിയും ഒരാളുടേതാണെങ്കിൽ കാരികയിൽ പറയേണമെന്നില്ല; വൃത്തിയിൽ പറഞ്ഞാലും മതി.

“അല്ലാക്ഷരമസംഭിശലം സാരവദിശപതോമുഖം  
അസ്തോഭമനവദ്യഞ്ച സൂത്രം സൂത്രവിഭോ വിദുഃ.”

എന്ന ലക്ഷണലക്ഷിതമായ സൂത്രമോ തൽസ്ഥാനീയമായ കാരികയോ നിർമ്മിക്കുന്നതോടുകൂടിത്തന്നെ വൃത്തിയും നിർമ്മിക്കുന്ന ആചാര്യന്മാർ അവശ്യവക്തവ്യത്വമർഹിക്കാത്തതോ അനൗക്തസിദ്ധമോ ആയ അംശത്തെ സൂത്രത്തിൽ നിർദ്ദേശിക്കാതെ വൃത്തിയിൽ വിവരിക്കുകയാണ് പതിവ്. കാവ്യപ്രകാശകാരൻ മാലോപമയേയും രശനോപമയേയും പററി മൂലത്തിൽ യാതൊന്നും പറയാതെ വൃത്തിയിൽ വിവരിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതും, കാവ്യാനുശാസനകാരൻ ആഖ്യാനം, നിദർശനം, പ്രഫലഫലിക, മതല്ലി, മണികല്പ, പരികഥ മുതലായവയെ സൂത്രത്തിൽ ലക്ഷിക്കാതെ വൃത്തിയിൽ പ്രതിപാദിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതും മറ്റും നോക്കുക. അതിന്നും പുറമേ, വൃത്തിയിൽ മാത്രം നിർദ്ദേശിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന അവിവക്ഷിതവാച്യം എന്നീ ധ്വനിസാമാന്യപ്രഭേദത്തെ ആധാരമാക്കി അവയുടെ വിശേഷ പ്രകാരങ്ങളെ “അത്ഥാന്തരേ സംക്രമിതം” എന്നിങ്ങനെ കാരികയിൽ പ്രതിപാദിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതു കാരികയും വൃത്തിയും ഒരാളുടേതല്ലെങ്കിൽ എങ്ങിനെ സംഗതമാകും? ഈവക കാരികകളുടെ സ്ഥിതി “മാലാതു പൂർവ്വത” എന്ന കാവ്യപ്രകാശകാരികയുടേതുപോലെത്തന്നെയല്ലേ? കാവ്യപ്രകാശത്തിലെ ആ കാരികാഭാഗം കർത്തൃകൃത്സാധകമാണെന്നു സമ്മതിക്കുന്ന സ്ഥിതിക്കു ധ്വനയാലോകത്തിലെ തത്സമാനയോഗക്ഷേമമായ ഈ കാരികകൾ കർത്തൃകൃത്സാധകങ്ങളല്ലെന്നു എങ്ങിനെ പറയാം? കാരികയും വൃത്തിയും ആനന്ദവൽനാചാര്യന്റേതാണെങ്കിൽ ആനന്ദ'ശബ്ദം കാരികയിൽത്തന്നെയല്ലേ പ്രയോഗിക്കുക? അതല്ലേ ഉചിതം? എന്നുള്ള ആശങ്കയും നിസ്സാരമാണ്. തൽക്കാലം ഓർമ്മി

ക്കാത്തകാര്യം സന്ദർഭസരണം ഓർമ്മവരുമ്പോൾ പര്യയക എന്നതു മനുഷ്യസ്വഭാവസിദ്ധമാണ്. അതിൽനിന്ന് ആചാര്യന്മാരും വ്യത്യസ്തരല്ല. എന്നാൽ, നമ്മെപ്പോലെ സർവ്വഥാ അബദ്ധമായ വചനം അഭിജ്ഞാനാരായ അവരുടെ മുഖത്തുനിന്നു നിർഗമിക്കാൻ അവകാശമില്ലാത്തതുകൊണ്ട് നാമിന്നു ചെയ്യുന്നതുപോലെ മുൻപറഞ്ഞതിന്നു സ്വപ്നം വല്ല നൃപനയുണ്ടെങ്കിലും അവർ അതു തിരുത്തി ഏഴുതുകയില്ലെന്നുമാത്രം ഒരു വിശേഷമുണ്ടുതാനും.

ഈ വസ്തുത,

\* “കിമത്ഥമിദമുപ്യതേ ഭവേ പ്രോക്താഭയശ്ച തദ്ധിതാഃ. ഇതി; ന പ്രോക്താഭയശ്ചതദ്ധിതാഃ ഇത്യേവ ഭവേപി തദ്ധിതശ്ചോദിതസ്യാൽ! പരസ്താദിദമാചാര്യേണ ദൃഷ്ടം ഭവേ ച തദ്ധിതഃ ഇതി; തൽ പഠിതം. തത ഉത്തരകാലമിദം ദൃഷ്ടം പ്രോക്താഭയശ്ച തദ്ധിതാ ഇതി; തദപി പഠിതം. ന ചേദാനീമാചാര്യസ്സത്രാണി കൃതാ നിവർത്തയന്തി” എന്നിങ്ങിനെ മഹാഭാഷ്യകാരൻ തന്നെ മുക്തകണ്ഠമുപന്യസിപ്പിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതു നോക്കുക. അതിനാൽ കാരികാനിർമ്മാണസമയത്തു് ഓർമ്മിക്കാതെ പോയ ആത്മപ്രതിഷ്ഠാലാഭസൂചനം സന്ദർഭസരണം വൃത്തിയിൽ ‘ആനന്ദ’ശബ്ദം പ്രയോഗിച്ചു് ആചാര്യൻ നിവൃത്തിപ്പെട്ടിരിക്കുന്നതായി വിചാരിക്കുന്നതിൽ ന്യായമുണ്ടല്ലോ. ഇങ്ങിനെ യിരിക്കെ, എന്നേ കാരികതന്നെ ‘ആനന്ദ’ശബ്ദമെഴുതിയതായി നിർമ്മിച്ചില്ലെന്നോ അപകാരം മാറ്റി എഴുതിയില്ലെന്നോ ചോദിച്ചുകൊണ്ട് അതിനെ കർത്തൃഭേദസാധകമായി ഉപന്യസിപ്പിച്ചതും നല്ലപോലെ ആലോചിക്കാതെയാണെന്ന് ഈ അവസരത്തിൽ അനുസ്മരിപ്പിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു. ആനന്ദപദം കാരികയിൽ പ്രയോഗിക്കാതെ വൃത്തിയിൽ

\* പശ്യശാഹ്നികത്തിൽ, വ്യാകരണശബ്ദാർത്ഥവിചാരകങ്ങളായ വാർത്തികങ്ങളെ വ്യാഖ്യാനിക്കുന്ന ഘട്ടത്തിലുള്ളതാണ് ഈ ഭാഷ്യപംക്തികൾ. എന്നതിനാണിതു പറഞ്ഞതു് ഭവാർത്ഥതദ്ധിതവും പ്രോക്താദ്യർത്ഥതദ്ധിതങ്ങളുമെന്ന്? “പ്രോക്താഭയശ്ച തദ്ധിതാഃ” എന്നു മാത്രം പോരേ? (പ്രോക്താഭയശ്ച എന്നതിലെ ആദിപദംകൊണ്ടു് ഭവാർത്ഥതദ്ധിതവും ഗ്രഹിക്കാവുന്നതായിരിക്കെ, പ്രത്യേകം “ഭവേ ച തദ്ധിതാഃ” എന്നു നീക്കം പറഞ്ഞു എന്നു പൂർവ്വപക്ഷം.) മുഖിൽ അചാര്യൻ കണ്ടതു് ഇതാണ്, ‘ഭവേ ച തദ്ധിതാഃ’ എന്നു്; അതു പറഞ്ഞു. പിന്നീടു് ഇതു കാണുകയുണ്ടായി ‘പ്രോക്താഭയശ്ചതദ്ധിതാഃ’ എന്നു്; അതും പറഞ്ഞു. ഇക്കാലത്തു് ആചാര്യന്മാരോട് സൂത്രങ്ങളെ നിർമ്മിച്ചു പിന്നീടു് മാറ്റുകയില്ല. എന്നർത്ഥം.



പ്രയോഗിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു എന്നുള്ള ഫേതു അനൈകാന്തികം—ഉഭയസാധാരണം—ആകയാൽ, കർതൃക്രൂതിയിന്നെന്നപോലെ കർതൃഭേദത്തിന്നും സാധകമായി ഉപന്യസിക്കാവുന്നതല്ലെന്നു താൽപര്യം.

ഇത്രയുംകൊണ്ട്, പ്രഥമകാരികയിൽ നിരസനീയതേപന നിർദ്ദേശിച്ച വാദത്രയത്തിൽ അനുപ്രേയവാദത്തെമാത്രം കാരികയിൽ നിരസിക്കാതെ വൃത്തിയിൽ അപ്രകാരം ചെയ്തിരിക്കുന്നതും വൃത്തിയിൽ മാത്രം നിർദ്ദേശിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന ധ്വനിസാമാന്യപ്രഭേദങ്ങൾക്കു കാരികയിൽ വിശേഷപ്രഭേദങ്ങളെ പ്രതിപാദിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതും കാരികാകാരണം വൃത്തികാരണം രൊളാണെന്നതിലേക്ക് ആദ്യന്തരമായ തെളിവായി എടുത്തു കാണിക്കുകയും, കർതൃഭേദസാധകങ്ങളായി ചിലർ ധരിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന ലോചനവാക്യങ്ങൾ കർതൃക്രൂതിയിൽ അനുപപന്നങ്ങളല്ലെന്ന് ഉപപാദിക്കയും ചെയ്തുകഴിഞ്ഞു. പ്രതിപക്ഷികൾ ഉദ്ധരിച്ച ലോചനവാക്യങ്ങൾ കർതൃക്രൂതിയിൽ അനുപപന്നങ്ങളല്ലെന്നതിരിക്കട്ടെ; നേരെമറിച്ചു കർതൃഭേദത്തിൽ അനുപപന്നങ്ങളായ ലോചനവാക്യങ്ങളെ ഇതി എടുത്തു കാണിക്കാം.

ഭിതീയോദ്യോതത്തിന്റെ പ്രാരംഭത്തിലുള്ള “ഏവമവിവക്ഷിതവാച്യവിവക്ഷിതാനുപരവാച്യതേന ധ്വനിർഭവിപ്രകാരകഃ പ്രകാശിതഃ” എന്ന വൃത്തിവാക്യത്തിലെ ‘പ്രകാശിതഃ’ എന്ന പദത്തെ ലോചനകാരൻ “പ്രകാശിത ഇതി മയാ വൃത്തികാരേണ സതേതിഭാവഃ” എന്നു വ്യാഖ്യാനിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതിലെ “സതാ എന്ന പദം വിശേഷിച്ചു ശ്രദ്ധിക്കേണ്ടതാണ്. വൃത്തികാരനായി ഭവിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന എന്നാൽ പ്രകാശിപ്പിക്കപ്പെട്ട്’ എന്നാണല്ലോ ആ പംക്തിക്കർത്ഥം. കാരികാകാരണം വൃത്തികാരണം ഒന്നാണെന്നതിലേക്കു ലോചനത്തിലെ ഈ വാക്യംതന്നെ ഒരു നല്ല തെളിവല്ലേ? ഇങ്ങിനെയിരിക്കെ, “ന ചൈതന്യോൽസൃതമുക്തം അപി തു കാരികാകാരാഭിപ്രായേണ” എന്നിങ്ങിനെയുള്ള അനന്തരപംക്തികളിലും മറ്റും സൂത്രകാരതപം വൃത്തികാരതപമെന്നീ ഉപാധിഭേദമവലംബിച്ചു ലോചനകാരൻ വ്യവഹരിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതു കർതൃഭേദത്തിന്നെങ്ങിനെയാണ് സാധകമാവുക? അത്രയുംല്ല, രണ്ടാമത്തെ ഉദ്യോതത്തിലെ “അസംലക്ഷ്യക്രമോദ്യോതഃ—” എന്ന കാരികയ്ക്കുള്ള ലോചനകാരന്റെ “അവിവക്ഷിതവാച്യസ്യ പ്രഭിന്നതപമിതി യദുക്തം നൽ കതഃ—” എന്നിങ്ങിനെയുള്ള അവതാ

രികയും കാരികാകാരണം വൃത്തികാരണം ഒന്നാകുന്നുവെന്നു തന്നെയാണ് ലോചനകാരന്റെ അഭിപ്രായമെന്നതിലേക്കു വേറെ ഒരു തെളിവാണ്. അവിവക്ഷിതവാച്യധ്വനിക്കു വിവക്ഷിതാന്യപരവാച്യധ്വന്യപേക്ഷയാ പ്രഭിന്നതപം പറഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്നതു വൃത്തികാരനാണല്ലോ. “തത്രാവിവക്ഷിതവാച്യസ്യ പ്രഭേദപ്രതിപാദനായ—” എന്നിങ്ങിനെ ഉദ്യോതാരംഭത്തിലെ വൃത്തിയും “തദവാന്തരപ്രഭേദപ്രതിപാദനഭാവാരേണൈവ ചാനവാദപാരേണ അവിവക്ഷിതവാച്യസ്യ യഃ പ്രഭേദഃ വിവക്ഷിതാന്യപരവാച്യാൽ പ്രഭിന്നതപം തൽപ്രതിപാദനായ—” എന്ന ലോചനകാരന്റെ വ്യാഖ്യാനവും നോക്കുക. കൂടാതെ, തൃതീയോദ്യോതത്തിലെ “യസ്തപലക്ഷ്യകൃമ—” എന്ന കാരികയുടെ അവതാരികാരൂപത്തിലുള്ള \* “ഏവം കാരികാം വ്യാഖ്യായ തദസംഗ്രഹീതമസംലക്ഷ്യകൃമവ്യംഗ്വം പ്രപഞ്ചയിതമാഹ—യസ്തപിതി” എന്ന ലോചനവാക്യം കാരികാകാരണം വൃത്തികാരണം ഒരാളാണെന്നതിലേക്കു പ്രധാനമായ മറ്റൊരു തെളിവാകുന്നു. രണ്ടും ഒരാളല്ലെങ്കിൽ ‘വ്യാഖ്യായ’ എന്ന ലുബന്തപ്രയോഗം ഘടിക്കയില്ല. ഇപ്രകാരം കാരികയെ വ്യാഖ്യാനിച്ച് (കാരികയ്ക്കു വൃത്തി എഴുതി) കാരികയിലുൾപ്പെടാത്ത അസംലക്ഷ്യകൃമവ്യംഗ്വത്തെ വിവരിക്കുവാനായി പറയുന്നു. “യസ്തപലക്ഷ്യകൃമ—” എന്ന കാരികയെ എന്നാണ് പ്രകൃതവാക്യത്തിന്റെ അർത്ഥം. ഈ സ്ഥിതിക്ക് വൃത്തിയെഴുതിയതാരോ ആയാൾ തന്നെയാണ് കാരികയെഴുതിയതും എന്നു സമ്മതിക്കാതെ ഗത്യാന്തരമില്ല. അല്ലാത്തപക്ഷം ‘കാരികാം വ്യാഖ്യായ’ എന്നു എങ്ങിനെ പ്രയോഗിക്കും? “സമാനകർത്തൃകയോഃ പൂർവ്വകാലേ—” എന്ന സൂത്രപ്രകാരം ധാതപത്മങ്ങൾ ഏകകർത്തൃകങ്ങളാണെന്നിലല്ലേ പൂർവ്വകാലത്തിലുള്ള ധാതുവിൽനിന്നു പരമായി ‘ക്തവാ’ എന്ന പ്രത്യയം വരികയുള്ളൂ. ‘വി+ആ’ എന്ന ഉപസർഗ്ഗങ്ങൾക്കുശേഷമുള്ള ‘ചക്ഷ’ ധാതുവിനു ‘ഖ്യാ’ എന്നും ‘ക്തവാ’ പ്രത്യയത്തിനു ‘യ’ എന്നും ആദേശം വന്നിട്ടാണല്ലോ ‘വ്യാഖ്യായ’ എന്ന രൂപം സിദ്ധിക്കുന്നത്. അതുകൊണ്ടു കാരികാകാരണം വൃത്തികാരണം ഊഹിതന്നെയാണെന്ന വസ്തുത ലോചനകാരന്റെ പ്രകൃതവാക്യം കൊണ്ടു വ്യക്തമാകുന്നു.

അതിന്നു പുറമെ, അഭിനവഗുപ്തന്റെ നാട്ടുശാസ്ത്രപ്രാഖ്യാനമായ 'അഭിനവഭാരത'യിലെ പല സ്ഥലങ്ങളും ധന്യാലോകത്തിലെ കാരികയും വൃത്തിയും ആനന്ദവൽനാചാർയ്യന്റെയെന്ന വസ്തുത വ്യക്തമാക്കുന്നുണ്ട്. സ്വപ്നം ചിലതെടുത്തു കാണിക്കാം.

\*“ഏതദേവോപജീവ്യാനന്ദവൽനാചാർയ്യേണോക്തം †സുപ്തി ഓപവനേത്യാദി” എന്ന അഭിനവഭാരതത്തിലെ വാക്യം കാരികാഗ്രന്ഥം ആനന്ദവൽനാചാർയ്യരുടേതാണെന്നു വ്യക്തമാക്കുന്നില്ലേ? ‡“ഏത മേവാർത്ഥം സമ്യഗ്നാനന്ദവൽനാചാർയ്യോപി വിവിച്യ ന്യരൂപയത്”

§“ധന്യാത്മഭൂതേ ശൃംഗാരേ സമീക്ഷ്യ വിനിവേശിതഃ  
രൂപകാലിരലധാര-വർഗ ഏതി യഥാത്ഥതാം.”

ഇത്യുക്തവാ ക്രമേണ—

§“വിവക്ഷാ തൽപരത്വേന നാംഗിത്വേന കഥഞ്ചന

കാലേ ച ഗ്രഹണത്യാഗേന നാതിനിവൃത്തമെന്നെഷിതാ.”

ഇത്യാദിനാ ഗ്രന്ഥസന്ദർഭേണ സോദാഹരണേന” എന്ന അഭിനവഭാരതത്തിലെ സന്ദർഭം കാരികയും വൃത്തിഗ്രന്ഥവും ആനന്ദവൽനാചാർയ്യരുടേതാണെന്നതിലേക്കു നല്ല തെളിവുണ്ടല്ലോ. ഉദാഹരണം വൃത്താംശമല്ലാതെ കാരികാംശമാകയില്ലെന്നതും തീർച്ചയല്ലേ?

ധന്യാലോകത്തിലെ കാരികയും വൃത്തിയും രണ്ടുപേരുടേതാണെന്നു ധരിച്ചത് അഭിനവഗുപ്താചാർയ്യന്റെ കാരികാകാരനെന്നും വൃത്തികാരനെന്നുമുള്ള പ്രയോഗം കണ്ടിട്ടുമാത്രമാണ്. ആ ധാരണ സർവ്വഥാ അബലമാണെന്ന് അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ വാക്കുകൊണ്ടുതന്നെ തെളിയിച്ചു കഴിഞ്ഞു.

പുറമെ, കാരികാകാരൻ മറ്റൊരാളായിരുന്നുവെങ്കിൽ വൃത്തി ഗ്രന്ഥംകൊണ്ട് താൻ പര്യുപാസിക്കുന്ന ആ മൂലകൃതിയുടെ കർത്താവിന്റെ പേർ മഹാനായ ആനന്ദവൽനാചാർയ്യർ സർവ്വഥാ ഗോപനം

\* വാക്യം 2, അദ്ധ്യായം 14, ഭാഗം 229.

† ധന്യാലോകം ഉദ്യോതം 3, ഭാഗം 153.

‡ അദ്ധ്യായം 16, ഭാഗം 229, 300.

§ ധന്യാലോകം ഉദ്യോതം 2, ഭാഗം 88.      § ടി.

ചെയ്തയില്ലെന്ന കാര്യവും ഒരു തെളിവായി സ്വീകരിക്കാവുന്നതാണ്. ആനന്ദവർമ്മൻ ആരുടേതാണെന്നറിയാത്തവിധം അത്ര പുരാതന രൂപം ധ്വനിഗ്രന്ഥത്തിനുണ്ടാവാനും വഴിയില്ല.

ഭട്ടോദ്ഭടൻ, വാമനൻ എന്നിവരെ,

\*“ആക്ഷിപ്ത ഏവാലങ്കാര-ശൃംഖലകൾ പ്രകാശ്യതേ”

†“അസ്സുടസ്സുരിതം കാവ്യ-തത്ത്വമേതദ്യഥോചിതം  
അശങ്കനവദ്ഭിർവ്യാകുൽതം രീതയ സ്തംഭവത്തിതാഃ”

എന്നീ കാര്യങ്ങളിൽ സ്മരിക്കുന്നുണ്ടെന്ന വസ്തുത—

‡“നന്ദലങ്കാരാന്തരപ്രതിഭാധാമപി ശ്ലേഷവ്യവഭാസോ ഭവതിതി ദർശിതം ഭട്ടോദ്ഭടനേ” §“ഏതൽ ധ്വനിനിർമ്മൂർത്തനേന നിർണീതം കാവ്യതത്ത്വമസ്സുടസ്സുരിതം സദശങ്കനവദ്ഭിഃ പ്രതിപാദയിതം വൈദിഗ്ഗി ഗൈരധി പാഞ്ചാലി ചേരി രീതയഃ പ്രവത്തിതാഃ—” ഇത്യാദി വൃത്തിഗ്രന്ഥംകൊണ്ട് ആനന്ദവർമ്മൻ വ്യക്തമാക്കിയിട്ടുണ്ട്. ആനന്ദവർമ്മൻ മുഖിൽ രീതിയെ വൈദർഭി, ഗൈരധി, പാഞ്ചാലി എന്നു മൂന്നായി വിഭാഗിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതും രീതിക്കു കാവ്യോത്തമരൂപം സിദ്ധാന്തിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതും വാമനൻ ഒരാളല്ലാതെ മറ്റൊരാളല്ല. ഉദ്ഭടനും വാമനനും ക്രിസ്തുവർഷം 778 മുതൽ 813 വരെ കാശ്മീരരാജ്യം ഭരിച്ചിരുന്ന ജയാപീഡന്റെ കാലത്തും, ആനന്ദവർമ്മൻ ക്രിസ്തുവർഷം 855 മുതൽ 883 വരെ അതേരാജ്യം ഭരിച്ചിരുന്ന അവന്തിവർമ്മന്റെ കാലത്തും പ്രസിദ്ധന്മാരായിരുന്നുവെന്നു മുമ്പുതന്നെ നിരൂപിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്. ഈ സ്ഥിതിക്ക്, ഉദ്ഭടാദികൾക്കും ആനന്ദവർമ്മനും തമ്മിൽ ഉള്ള അന്തരം 70 വർഷം മാത്രമാണ്. ധ്വനികാരനായി പ്രത്യേകം ഒരു വ്യക്തി ഇവരുടെ ഇടയ്ക്കുണ്ടെന്നു വരുമ്പോൾ അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ സത്ത ആനന്ദവർമ്മനേക്കാളും ഏറിയത് ഒരു നല്ലതുവർഷത്തിലധികം മുമ്പാവാൻ തരമില്ല. മുപ്പതോ നാല്പ്പതോ വർഷങ്ങൾക്കു മുമ്പു ജീവിച്ചിരുന്ന ഒരാളുടെ ഗ്രന്ഥത്തിന്നു വൃത്തി എഴുതുന്ന ആൾക്കു മുഖകാരൻ ആരാണെന്നു നിശ്ചയമില്ലെന്നു വരിക സംഭാവ്യമാണോ? അതിനാൽ കാരകാകാരന്റെ പേർ നിശ്ചയമില്ലാത്തതുകൊണ്ടാണ് വൃത്തികാരൻ നിർദ്ദേശിക്കാതിരുന്ന

\* ധ്വനിലോകം ഉദ്ഭോതം 2, ഭാ. 95. † ധ്വനിലോകം ഉദ്ഭോതം 3, ഭാ. 231.

‡ ടി. ഉദ്ഭോതം 2, ഭാഗം 96.

§ ടി. ഉദ്ഭോതം 3, ഭാഗം 231.

തന്നെ വിചാരിക്കാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ല. ഈ സ്ഥിതിക്ക്, കാരികാ കാരൻ മറെറാരായാലും അന്നുവെങ്കിൽ നിശ്ചയമായും ആനന്ദവർണ്ണാചാര്യർ ഗൗരവപ്രകാശനാത്മം അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ പേർ പറയുമായിരുന്നുവെന്നും അങ്ങിനെ ചെയ്തുകാണാത്തതുകൊണ്ട് കാരികാഗ്രന്ഥവും വൃത്തിഗ്രന്ഥവും ആനന്ദവർണ്ണാചാര്യരുടേതാണെന്നും തീർമാനിക്കാവുന്നതാണ്.

അത്രമാത്രമല്ല, 'കാവ്യപ്രകാശം' എന്നപോലെ കാരികയ്ക്കും വൃത്തിയ്ക്കും കൂടി അഖണ്ഡരൂപത്തിലുള്ള കാവ്യാലോകം സഹൃദയാലോകം എന്ന പ്രകൃതഗ്രന്ഥത്തിന്റെ സംജ്ഞാത്തരങ്ങൾതന്നെ കാരികയും വൃത്തിയും ഏകകർത്തൃകമാണെന്നു സൂചിപ്പിക്കുന്നുണ്ടെന്ന കാര്യവും വിസ്തരിക്കാവുന്നതല്ല. പ്രസ്തുത സംജ്ഞകൾ വിഭാഗയോഗ്യങ്ങളാണോ? കാരികാഗ്രന്ഥത്തിന്റെ സംജ്ഞ കാവ്യമെന്നോ സഹൃദയമെന്നോ ആക്കുന്നതു യുക്തമാവുമോ? കാവ്യാലോകം, സഹൃദയാലോകമെന്നിവ വൃത്തിഗ്രന്ഥത്തിന്നു മാത്രമുള്ള സംജ്ഞകളല്ലെന്നതു അഭിനവഗുപ്തപ്രയോഗംകൊണ്ടു സ്പഷ്ടമാണ്.

ഇനി പ്രസ്തുതവസ്തുതയ്ക്കു സാധകങ്ങളായി മറ്റു ഗ്രന്ഥകാരന്മാരുടെ—ആനന്ദവർണ്ണാചാര്യരുടെ കാലത്തിൽനിന്നു വളരെ അകന്ന കാലത്തിലല്ലാത്തവരുടെ—വാക്യങ്ങൾ എടുത്തു കാണിക്കാം.

ആദ്യമായി 'സൂക്തിമുക്താവലി'യിൽ രാജശേഖരൻ്റെതാണെന്ന് അഭിപ്രായപ്പെട്ടുകൊണ്ടു ജല്പമണൻ ഉദ്ധരിച്ചു കാണിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന,

“ധ്വനിനാതിഗഭീരേണ കാവ്യതത്ത്വനിവേശിനാ  
ആനന്ദവർണ്ണഃ കസ്യ നാ സീദാനന്ദവർണ്ണഃ”

എന്ന പദ്യംതന്നെ എടുക്കാം. “കാവ്യതത്ത്വത്തെ സഹൃദയന്മാരുടെ ഹൃദയത്തിൽ നിവേശിപ്പിക്കുന്നതും അതിപ്രൗഢവുമായ ധ്വനാഖ്യഗ്രന്ഥവിശേഷത്താൽ ആനന്ദവർണ്ണൻ ഏതൊരു സഹൃദയന്” ആനന്ദവർണ്ണനായി ഭവിച്ചില്ല” എന്നാണല്ലോ പ്രകൃതപദ്യത്തിന്റെ അർത്ഥം. കാവ്യതത്ത്വനിവേശിയും അതിഗർഭീരവുമായ ധ്വനി എന്നതു നാമൈകദേശസ്ത്രയപ്രകാരം ധ്വന്യാലോകമോ അഥവാ കാരികാത്മകമായ ധ്വനിഗ്രന്ഥമോ അല്ലാതെ 'ആലോക'മെന്ന വൃത്തിഗ്രന്ഥം മാത്രമാകയില്ലെന്നുള്ളതു തീർച്ചയാണ്. അതിനാൽ ധ്വന്യാലോകം അഥവാ

ധപനിഗ്രന്ഥം ആനന്ദവർണ്ണനന്തരം തിരുവടക്കു രാജശേഖരന്റെ പ്രകൃതപദ്യത്തെ പ്രധാനമായ ഒരു തെളിവായിരിക്കുന്നു. ആനന്ദവർണ്ണനക്കൊരു പ്രായക്കുറവുണ്ടെങ്കിലും ഏതാണ്ടുതേകാലത്തുതന്നെ, അതായത് ഒമ്പതാം നൂറ്റാണ്ടിന്റെ ഉത്തരാർദ്ധത്തിൽത്തന്നെ ജീവിച്ചിരുന്ന രാജശേഖരന്റെ വാക്കിനു പ്രസ്തുതവിഷയത്തിലുള്ള പ്രാമാണ്യം നിർവ്വിവാദമാണ്. പ്രകൃതപദ്യം രാജശേഖരന്റെ ‘ഹരവിലാസം’ മഹാകാവ്യത്തിലെ കവിപ്രശംസാസന്ദർഭത്തിലുള്ളതായിരിക്കാനും ഇടയുണ്ട്. ഏതായാലും രാജശേഖരന്റെ കാവ്യമീമാംസയിൽ \* “പ്രതിഭാവ്യൽപത്തോഃ പ്രതിഭാ ശ്രേയസീത്യാനന്ദഃ സാ ഹി കവേരവ്യൽപത്തികൃതം ദോഷമാഹ്ലാഭയതി” എന്നിങ്ങിനെ നാമനിർദ്ദേശപൂർവ്വം ആനന്ദവർണ്ണനാചാര്യരുടെ അഭിപ്രായം ഉപന്യസിച്ചുകൊണ്ട്—

“അവ്യൽപത്തികൃതോ ദോഷ ജ്ഞക്ത്വാ സംപ്രിയതേ കവേഃ  
യസ്തപശക്തികൃതസ്സ്യ സ്വമിത്യേവാവഭാസതേ.”

എന്ന ധപന്യാലോകത്തിലെ പരികരശ്ലോകത്തെ ഉദ്ധരിച്ചു കാണിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതും പ്രത്യേകിച്ചു † “നിഹതസഹചരീവിരഹകാതരക്രൗഞ്ചാക്രന്ദജനിതശ്ലോക ഏവ” എന്ന ധപന്യാലോകവാക്യത്തിലെ വാല്മീകിരാമായണവിരുദ്ധമായ ആശയത്തെ അതേപ്രകാരത്തിൽ ‡ “നിഷാദനിഹതസഹചരീകം ക്രൗഞ്ചയുവാനം കരുണക്രോധാരയാ ഗിരാ ക്രന്ദന്തമുദപീക്ഷ്യ ശോകവാൻ” എന്നിങ്ങിനെ അനുവദിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതും ആനന്ദവർണ്ണനാചാര്യനിലുള്ള പ്രാമാണികതപബുദ്ധിയാലാണെന്നും അതിനാൽ അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ കൃതിയായ ധപന്യാലോകത്തെ വിശേഷിച്ചു ട്രാഫിക്കാൻ ന്യായമുണ്ടെന്നും വിചാരിക്കാവുന്നതുമാണ്.

ഇതു പോരെന്നുവരികിൽ ആനന്ദവർണ്ണന്റെ കാലത്തിന്നു കഷ്ടിച്ചൊരു നൂറ്റാണ്ടിനുശേഷം ജീവിച്ചിരുന്ന കുന്തകന്റെ വചനം മറ്റൊരു തെളിവായി ഹാജരാക്കാം. § ധപന്യാലോകത്തിൽ ഉദാഹരിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന “താലാ ജാഅന്തി ഗുണാഃ—” എന്ന ആനന്ദവർണ്ണന്റെ പദ്യത്തെ കുന്തകൻ തന്റെ ‘വക്ത്രോക്തിജീവിത’ത്തിൽ രൂഢിപ്പെ

\* അദ്ധ്യായം 5, ഭാഗം 16.

† ധപന്യാലോകം ഉദ്ദേശം 1, ഭാഗം 27.

‡ അദ്ധ്യായം 3, ഭാഗം 7.

§ ഉദ്ദേശം 2, ഭാഗം 62.

ചിത്രവക്ത്രയ്ക്കു് ഉദാഹരിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു് \* “യസ്താൽ ധ്വാനികാരേണ വ്യാഗ്രവ്യാജകഭാവോത്രസുതരാം സമത്വിതഃ തൽ കിം പേഷനതുകേത്യന” എന്നു പറഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്നതാണു് അതു്. ആനന്ദവർണ്ണനെ കന്തകൻ ധ്വാനികാരെന്നു പറഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്നതിൽനിന്നു ‘ധ്വാനി’ എന്ന കാരികാഗ്രന്ഥം ആനന്ദവർണ്ണൻറതാണെന്നു തെളിയുന്നില്ലേ? അല്ലാത്ത പക്ഷം, ആലോകകാരനെന്നോ ധ്വാനാലോകകാരനെന്നോ അല്ലേ പറയേണ്ടതു്? കൂടാതെ ധ്വാനാലോകത്തിലെ കാരികയും വൃത്തിയും ഒരാളുടേതാണെന്നു തെളിയിക്കുന്ന അസംഖ്യം സന്ദർഭങ്ങൾ ലോചനകാരണു് ഏതാണ്ടു് സമാനകാലികനായ മഹിമഭട്ടൻറ വ്യക്തിവിവേകത്തിൽ കാണുന്നുണ്ടു്. അവയൊക്കെയും ഇവിടെ എടുത്തു കാണിച്ചു് ഈ പ്രബന്ധം ദീർഘിപ്പിച്ചിട്ടാവശ്യകതയില്ലായ്കയാൽ ഏതാനും ചിലതുമാത്രമേ പ്രദർശിപ്പിക്കുന്നുള്ളൂ.

“ഇഹ സമ്പ്രതിപത്തിതോന്യഥാവാ  
ധ്വാനികാരസ്യ വചോവിവേചനം നഃ  
നിയതം യശസേ പ്രപത്യതേ യ-  
നന്താം സംസ്തവ ഏവ ഗൌരവായ.”

എന്നിങ്ങിനെ മഹിമഭട്ടൻ ഗ്രന്ഥാരംഭത്തിൽത്തന്നെ പറഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്ന ആ ധ്വാനികാരവചസ്പിൽ ധ്വാനാലോകത്തിലെ കാരികയും വൃത്തിയും ഉൾപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നുള്ള വസ്തുതയ്ക്കു വ്യക്തിവിവേകം ആദ്യന്തം സാക്ഷ്യം വഹിക്കുന്നുണ്ടു്.

“ധ്വാനികാരേണൈവോക്തം, തദ്യഥാ—<sup>1</sup>യത്രാത്മശബ്ദാവ”

“തഥാചാഹ ധ്വാനികാരഃ <sup>2</sup>സാരത്രപോഹ്യത്വം  
[സ്വശബ്ദാനഭി—” (ഭാഗം 11.)

“യൽ സ ഏവാഹ <sup>3</sup>വ്യാജകതപമാർഗേ തു യദന്തോ—”  
(ഭാഗം 11.)

“പുനസ്ത ഏവാഹ <sup>4</sup>നഹി വ്യാഗ്രേ പ്രതീയമാനേ—”  
(ഭാഗം 11.)

\* ഉദ്ധേഷം 2, ഭാഗം 88, 89.

(1) ധ്വാനാലോകം ഉദ്ദ്യോതം 1, ഭാ. 33. (2) ടി. ഉദ്ദ്യോതം 4, ഭാ. 239.

(3) ടി. ഉദ്ദ്യോതം 3, ഭാ. 192. (4) ടി. ഉദ്ദ്യോതം 3, ഭാ. 199.

“തഥാ തേനൈവ വ്യക്തിവാദിനാ തയോസ്തപരൂപം നിരൂപയിതു കമേനാപ്യുക്തം—

തദ്യഥാ, <sup>1</sup>നമി വിഭാവാനഭാവ വ്യഭിചാരിണ ഏവ—”  
(ഭാഗം 11.)

“ധ്വാനികൃതാപ്യുക്തം <sup>2</sup>സാരരൂപോദ്ധൃതം സ്വശബ്ദം—”  
(ഭാഗം 14.)

“ധ്വാനികാരണാപ്യുക്തം <sup>3</sup>സ്വരൂപം പ്രകാശയന്നേവ പദാത്ഥം വഭാസനോ വ്യാജക ഇത്യുച്യതേ—”  
(ഭാഗം 15.)

“ധ്വാനികാരസ്വാഭിമതഃ, യദ മാഹ <sup>4</sup>നമി വാഭാവാനഭാവ—”  
(ഭാഗം 16.)

“യൽ സ ഏവാഹ <sup>5</sup>‘കാവ്യസ്വാത്മാ ധ്വാനി—’ ‘കാവ്യസ്വാത്മാ സ ഏവാത്മഃ’ ഇതി പ്രതീയമാനാ തപന്യൈവ—ഇതി ച—”  
(ഭാഗം 19.)

“തേന തത്രൈവ <sup>6</sup>‘പ്രതീയമാനം’ ‘സരസ്വതീ സ്വാഭ—’”  
(ഭാഗം 19, 20.)

“യൽ സ ഏവാഹ <sup>7</sup>കാവ്യസ്വാത്മാ സ ഏവാത്മഃ—”  
(ഭാഗം 20.)

“യദാഹ ധ്വാനികാരഃ <sup>8</sup>ശബ്ദാത്ഥയോഹി—” (ഭാഗം 29.)

ഇങ്ങിനെ പകർത്തിത്തുടങ്ങിയാൽ അടുത്തൊന്നും അവസാനിക്കുമെന്നു തോന്നുന്നില്ല. ഇത്രയും പ്രഥമവിമർശത്തിലുള്ളതു മാത്രമാണ്. ഇവയിൽ ധ്വാനികാരം, ധ്വാനി കൃൽ, വ്യക്തിവാദി എന്നീ ശബ്ദങ്ങളേയും പൂർവ്വോക്തപരാമർശിയായ തത്ത്വബുദ്ധനായ പരസുരിച്ചുകൊണ്ട് കാരകികളേയും വൃത്തിവാക്യങ്ങളേയും ഒരേ ആളുടേതാണെന്നു അഭി

(1) ടി. ഉദ്ഭോതം 3, ഭാ. 183. (2) ടി. ഉദ്ഭോതം 4, ഭാ. 239.

(3) ടി. ഉദ്ഭോതം 3, ഭാ. 195. അച്ചടിച്ച ധ്വാനിരോപകത്തിലെ പാഠം സ്വപ്നം വ്യത്യസ്തമായിട്ടാണ് കാണുന്നത്.

(4) ടി. ഉദ്ഭോതം 3, ഭാ. 183. (5) ടി. ഉദ്ഭോതം 1, ഭാ. 2, 16, ഉദ്ഭോതം 3, ഭാ. 211.

(6) ടി. ഉദ്ഭോതം 1, ഭാ. 14, 29. (7) ടി. ഉദ്ഭോതം 1, ഭാ. 16. ധ്വാനിരോപകം ഉദ്ഭോതം 3, ഭാ. 197.

(8) ടി. ഉദ്ഭോതം 3, ഭാ. 211.



പ്രായത്തിൽ അവിരോധേണ നിർദ്ദേശിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതു കാരികയും വൃത്തിയും ഒരാളുടേതാണെന്നതിന്നു തെളിവാണ്ല്ലോ.

എന്തിന്നു വളരെ,

(12) “യദാഹ ധ്വനികാരഃ സർവ്വമാ നാശ്യേവ ഹൃദയഹാരിണഃ കാവ്യസ്യ സ പ്രകാരഃ യത്ര പ്രതീയമാനാത്മസംസ്കർശേന സൗഭാഗ്യം തദിദം കാവ്യരഹസ്യം പരമമിതിസ്മരിദിദ്വിഭാവനീയം.

മദ്ധ്യാ മഹാകവിഗിരാം അലംകൃതി ജുഷാമപി

പ്രതീയമാനാത്മസംസ്കർശേന ഭൂഷാ ലഭേജവ യോഷിതാം ഇതി.

(ഭാഗം 34.)

എന്നിങ്ങിനെ വൃത്തിയും കാരികയും ധ്വനികാരന്റേതായി നിർദ്ദേശിക്കുക മാത്രമല്ല, <sup>1</sup> “യത്രാത്മം ശൃംബോവാ—” എന്ന ധ്വനിലക്ഷണത്തിലെ അത്മശബ്ദപ്രയോഗത്തെ ഭൂഷിക്കുന്ന അവസരത്തിൽ “അത്ഥോ വാച്യവിശേഷഃ ഇതി സ്വയം വിവൃതപാച്ച” (ഭാഗം 17.) എന്നിങ്ങിനെ വൃത്തിഗ്രന്ഥം കാരികയ്ക്കുള്ള ധ്വനികാരന്റേ സ്വന്തം വിവരണമാണെന്നു സ്പഷ്ടമായി പറഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്നതും നോക്കുക. കാരികയും വൃത്തിയും ആനന്ദവർണ്ണനാചാര്യന്റേതാണെന്നതിലേക്കു ഇതിൽ പരം തെളിവെന്താണ് വേണ്ടിയിരിക്കുന്നത്. ആകയാൽ, അപ്പാമീനന്മാരായ ‘വ്യക്തിവിവേകവിചാര’കാരൻ, ‘സാമിത്വഭൂപ്പണ’കാരൻ, ‘രസഗംഗാധര’കാരൻ മുതലായവരുടെ വാക്യങ്ങളെ ഇവിടെ കർതൃകൃതിഷയത്തിൽ തെളിവാക്കേണ്ടതു കാണിച്ച് ഈ വിചാരത്തെ ഇനിയും ദീർഘിപ്പിക്കണമെന്നു വിചാരിക്കുന്നില്ല. ഇത്രയുകൊണ്ട് ധ്വനോലോകത്തിലെ കാരികയും വൃത്തിയും ആനന്ദവർണ്ണനാചാര്യന്റേതാണെന്നു സംസിദ്ധമായല്ലോ.

പി. കൃഷ്ണൻനായർ.

## NOTES ON KĀLIDĀSA

By

DR. C. KUNHAN RAJA

### 1. THE BHARATAVĀKYA IN THE MĀLAVIKĀGNIMITRA

In the Bharatavākya of the Mālavikāgnimitra there is a reference to the hero of the story. Can we conclude from this that the drama was written during the life-time of the hero, namely the king Agnimitra? This is a matter which needs some consideration. The matter has been dealt with before and some answer has been given to the question. The answer is in the negative and very few accept the position that Kālidāsa, the author of the Mālavikāgnimitra was a contemporary of king Agnimitra. The problem of the date of Kālidāsa has been approached on the assumption that he was a contemporary of Vikramāditya; and the only question that has been attempted is that of the identity of the Vikramāditya in whose court Kālidāsa spent his time.

In this Paper I try to consider if the name of Agnimitra could find a place in the Bharatavākya, if the drama had been written long after the time of Agnimitra.

Every Sanskrit Drama contains two parts. There is the story proper and before the actual story begins there is a prologue. This prologue contains statements relating to events during the time of the author. The prologue contains the words of the author to the audience put into the mouth of the actor. In uttering these words the actor appears on the stage in his personal capacity as an actor and not in the role of a character of the drama. Thus when in the prologue of the drama, Mālavikāgnimitra, the Pāripārsika speaks of Bhāsa and other poets that have preceded,<sup>1</sup> it is with

1. prathitayaśasām bhāṣakaviputrasaumillākādīnām prabandhān  
atikramya vartamānakaveḥ kālīdāsasya kriyām imām draṣṭum katham  
parīśado bahumānaḥ. There are some differences in the readings,  
one manuscript reading dhāvaka for bhāsa (see Karmakar's edition).

reference to the time the drama was written and not with reference to the incidents of the story dealt with in the drama. Therefore, from the mention of Bhāsa in the prologue of the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, we conclude that Bhāsa was anterior to the time when the drama was written and not antecedent to the time when the incidents in the story of the drama took place.

The same is true of the *Bharatavākya* in a drama; most of the dramas end in some such way as what follows:

“What more do you want?”

“What more need I hope beyond this; yet let it be thus:” and then there follows a verse in which there is a wish for the prosperity of the people. Although the characters are still on the stage and although these words are uttered by the actors with the costume of the characters in the story, these words are not uttered by the actors in their role as characters in the story but only in their own capacity as actors. The *Bharatavākya*, as the final benedictory verse is usually called, is the word of the poet uttered by the actors in their individual capacity. This is the difference between the story proper on one side and the prologue and the *Bharatavākya* on the other side. In most of the dramas, the *Bharatavākya* cannot be interpreted with propriety as a part of the story. At the point in the drama where the above quoted conversation begins, the actors cast off their role as characters in the drama and assume their individual capacity. Taking into consideration the other two dramas of Kālidāsa, it may be noted that the *Bharatavākya* is quite general. Thus in the *Śākuntala*, the last Act ends thus:

mārīcaḥ : vatsa kim te bhūyaḥ priyam upakaromi.

rājā : ataḥ param api priyam asti. Yadiha bhagavān  
priyam kartum icchati tarhiḍam astu—

pravartatām prakṛtihitāya pārthivaḥ  
sarasvatī śrutamahatī mahīyatām  
mamāpi ca kṣapayatu nīlaloḥitaḥ  
punarbhavam parigataśaktir ātmabhūḥ

Will king Duṣṣanta pray for the king to endeavour for the good of the people? It is quite appropriate if the author makes the

prayer after the drama and if the actor recites it. •It is not quite appropriate in the mouth of the hero of the drama.

The Bharatavākya in the Vikramorvaśīya is :

parasparavirodhinyor ekasaṃśrayadurlabham  
saṅgatam śrīsarasvatyor bhūtaye 'stu sadā satām

I cannot say that there is much that is against the hero making such a prayer. Yet it will be more appropriate as a prayer of the poet recited from the stage by an actor than as a prayer of the hero at the end of the triumph of his life.

The Bharatavākya in the Nāgānanda and in the Ratnāvali of Śrī Harṣa are more or less of the same nature : They are—

(Nāgānanda)

vṛṣṭim hr̥ṣṭasīkhaṇḍitāṇḍavakṛte muñcantu kāle 'mbudāḥ  
kurvantu pratirūḍhasantataharicchasyottariyām kṣitim  
cinvānāḥ sukṛtāni vītavipado nirmatsarair mānasair  
modantām satatam ca bāndhavasuhṛdgoṣṭhīpramodāḥ  
prajāḥ

(Ratnāvali)

urvīm uddāmasasyām janayatu viśṛjan vāsavo vṛṣṭim iṣṭām  
iṣṭais traiviṣṭapānām vidadhatu vidhivat priṇanam vipra-  
mukhyāḥ  
ākālpāntam ca bhūyāt samupacitasukhaḥ saṅgamas sajjanā-  
nām  
niśśeṣam yāntu śāntim piśunajanagiro durjayā vajralepāḥ

The Bharatavākya in the Nāgānanda is preceded by another verse, which is undoubtedly a part of the story. It is the word of the hero. The verse is :

trāto 'yam śaṅkhacūḍaḥ patagapatibhayād vainateyo  
vinītas  
tena prāḡ bhakṣitā ye viśadharapatayo jīvitās te 'pi sarve  
matprāṇāptyā ca muktā na gurubhir asavaś cakravartitvam  
āptam  
sākṣāt tvam devi dṛṣṭā priyam aparam ataḥ kim punaḥ  
prārthyate yat.

At this stage the story ends and the remaining words: tathāpīdam astu, is outside the story. I do not hold that the last verse in the Nāgānanda is inappropriate in the mouth of the hero. Not at all. This too can be a prayer by the hero to the goddess. But the only point which I want to emphasise is that just as in the Śākuntala and in the Vikramorvāṣīya, similarly here also, there is nothing in the Bharatavākya which connects it to the story. It is only a general sort of prayer and there is nothing special in it to relate it to the story.

In the Mālatīmādhava Bhavabhūti adds a Bharatavākya which is more or less similar to the Bharatavākya in Śrī Harṣa's Nāgānanda. The verse is:—

santas santu nirantaram sukṛtino vidhvastatāpodayā  
rājāṇaḥ paripālayantu vasudhām dharme sthitāḥ sarvadā  
kāle santatavarṣiṇo jalamucaḥ santu sthirāḥ paśyato  
modantām dhanabadhabāndhavasuhṛdgoṣṭhīpramodāḥ  
prajāḥ

This too is of a very general nature. There is nothing which connects it to the story. If in the second pāda the mention had been about the king and not about kings, we could have connected it to the king, mentioned in the story.

The same is the case with the Bharatavākya in the Veṇiṣaṃhāra. The verse is:—

akṛpaṇam arukṣrāntam jīvyāj janaḥ puruṣāyuṣam  
bhavatu bhagavan bhaktir dvaitam vinā puruṣottame  
dayitabhuvano vidvadbandhur guṇeṣu viśeṣavit  
satatasukṛtī bhūyād bhūpaḥ prasādhitamaṇḍanaḥ

Is it possible that Yudhiṣṭhira after his final triumph should pray for the king to be a beneficent ruler? Who can this king be if it be the word of Yudhiṣṭhira? Evidently it must be the word of the poet recited by the actor in his own capacity.

I have taken the Bharatavākya from the various standard dramas in Sanskrit and it is found that in none of them is there a direct connection with the main story of the drama. In some cases the idea in the Bharatavākya is inappropriate as coming from the hero.

The Bharatavākya in the Uttararāmacarita proves beyond any doubt that it is only the prayer of the author and that it cannot have any connection with the story. The verse is

pāpmabhyaś ca punāti vardhayati ca śreyāṃsi seyam  
kathā  
māṅgalyā ca manoharā ca jagato māleṣa gaṅgeva ca  
tām etām paribhāvayantv abhinayair vinyastarūpām  
budhāḥ  
śabdabrahmavidāḥ kaveḥ pariṇatām prājñasya vāṇīm  
imām.

Certainly Śrī Rāma cannot announce from the stage that the story is particularly holy and cannot ask the audience to appreciate the story as adapted to the stage by a great poet. It must be the actor who has said this and not the hero of the story.

There are reasons to believe that in the prologue the Sūtra-dhāra appeared in the costume of the chief character of the story.<sup>2</sup> Of this I will take some other opportunity to say something in detail. Similarly, although at the Bharatavākya the actor is on the stage in the costume of the hero, he ceases to represent the hero. He becomes himself. When the audience hears the words:

tathāpīdam astu

they know that the story has ended and that the rest is the word of the poet. In many editions of the various dramas I see this passage printed as:

tathāpīdam astu bharatavākyaṃ.

It must really be:

tathāpīdam astu (Bharatavākyaṃ).

2. The verse in the Śākuntala :

tavāsmi gītārāgeṇa hārinā prasabham hṛtaḥ  
eṣa rājeva duṣṣantaḥ sārāṅgeṇātiraṃhasā  
seems to suggest that the word eṣa means the speaker himself and not the actor appearing from the green-room. The words at the end of the prologue in the Mālatīmādhava is more clear on the point :

Sūtradhāraḥ—eṣo 'smi kāmāndaki saṃvṛttaḥ  
Naṭaḥ—aham apy avalokitā

The word *Bharatavākya* here is a stage direction and not a part of the speech.

It has been argued that the *Bharatavākya* is not a part of the poet's composition and that it was later added. Thus the verses

pravartatām prakṛtihitāya pāṛthivah

etc., are not the compositions of Kālidāsa etc. Although the word *Bharatavākya* does not occur in early works on dramaturgy, the last section in a drama is said to be *praśasti* and this is nothing but the *Bharatavākya*. If it were added by later hands we have no reason to expect different *Bharatavākyas* for different dramas; we would have the same *Bharatavākya* for all the dramas or different *Bharatavākyas* for the different schools of actors. The very fact of the difference of the *Bharatavākyas* for the different dramas proves that it has something to do with the author of the drama. It is also certain that the *Bharatavākya* is not a part of the story.

The *Bharatavākya* in the *Mālavikāgnimitra* is—

tvam me prasādasumukhī bhava caṇḍi nityam  
etāvad eva mṛgaye pratipakṣahetoḥ  
āśāsyam itivirahaprabhṛti prajānām  
sampatsyate na khalu goptari nāgnimitre.

Here the first half of the verse is a part of the story; it is said by *Agnimitra* to *Dhārīṇī*.

At this stage the audience is accustomed to hear some prayer of the author for prosperity in the land. In this drama, one finds a new technique. Even in the last verse one notices the real story continuing so far as the first half of the verse is concerned. The second half is the statement of the author in explanation of this deviation from the normal practice. That is the force of the word "*āśāsyam*" in the beginning of the second half. The poet tells the audience (of course as recited by the actor) that what is normally prayed for at this stage (*āśāsyam*), namely absence of *īti* etc.... there is no possibility of their not being available in abundance when *Agnimitra* is the protector. This is the explanation for the omission of the usual prayer. The word *āśāsyam* means both what you must be looking for and also what is prayed for.

There is no doubt that the first half is the word of *Agnimitra* the hero. But how can the second half be the word of *Agnimitra*?

Will Agnimitra himself say, "so long as I am <sup>here</sup> to protect you, you need not pray for prosperity?"

The only serious objection that I have found raised against the drama being attributed to the life-time of Agnimitra is that no poet would have written such a drama with Agnimitra as the hero during his life-time. The hero is portrayed in very unfavourable colours. This is a point which needs serious consideration.

But is Agnimitra portrayed in such unfavourable colours in the drama? He appears for the first time as an able warrior brave in battle, firm in decision and having all the noble qualities of a great hero. In the end also he appears in the same colours. It is true that there is a sort of interlude in the middle, which is the main story of the drama. Thus the drama is a love romance with a heroic historical back-ground. No one is a hero in the harem. He knows what weapons he has to use in political matters and also what weapons he has to wield in love matters. There is no compromise in politics. There is no heroism in love. This is what we find in the other drama of Kālidāsa, namely, the *Vikramorvaśīya*. The king there is a great hero; but he is the same submissive person in front of his queen in the harem. There is only one statement in the whole of the *Mālavikāgnimitra* which reflects some inability in Agnimitra as a ruler and that is the statement of Dhārīṇī at the end of the first Act that it would have been well if the king had shown the same intelligence in administrative matters also.<sup>3</sup> But this comes from the queen and does not in any way detract from his greatness as a hero. The general impression left on the reader after going through the *Mālavikāgnimitra* is that Agnimitra is a great warrior, as great as Purūravas. Even Duṣṣanta ceases to be a hero when he comes into the presence of the girls in the first Act of the *Śākuntala*. That is the case with all heroes. Kālidāsa portrays heroes as heroes only where heroism is appropriate. Even a hero is human and has all the weaknesses of an ordinary man.

Thus all the evidences tend to prove that the *Mālavikāgnimitra* was written by Kālidāsa during the reign of Agnimitra. It may be that his son Vasumitra was a great lover of dramatic art

3. yadi rājakāryeṣv apidr̥ṣy upāyanipuṇatāryaputrasya tadā śobhanam bhavet.



and the reference in <sup>1</sup>Harṣacarita<sup>4</sup> to Sumitra having been murdered by the enemy in the guise of an actor since Sumitra is a great lover of dramatic art may be to Vasumitra, the son of Agnimitra.

The only other point to be considered is the question of the Bharatavākya in the Mudrārākṣasa where the name of the hero is introduced. The Bharatavākya is—

vārāhīm ātmayones tanum avanavidhāv āsthitasyā-  
nūrūpam  
yasya prāgdantakoṭim pralayaparigatā śīśriye bhūta-  
dhātrī  
mlecchair udvijyamānā bhujayugam adhunā saṁśritā  
rājamūrteḥ  
sa śrīmadbandhubhṛtyaś ciram avatu mahīm pārthivaś  
candraguptaḥ.

There are evidences to show that Viśākhadatta the author of the Mudrārākṣasa lived at the time of Candragupta II of the Gupta dynasty, who assumed the title of Vikramāditya. The reference to Candragupta can be to this real Candragupta II, with of course a concealed reference to the hero also. The term Mlecchair uddvijyamānām must be a reference to the Śaka king who asked for the hands of Dhruvasvāminī the wife of the Emperor Rāmagupta and on account of this illicit love for the wife of another person was killed by Candragupta. There are references to Rāmagupta having agreed to hand over his wife to the Śaka king as a term of peace.<sup>5</sup>

The reference in Mudrārākṣasa to the hero in the Bharatavākya is no evidence of introducing the name of the hero of the drama into the Bharatavākya as a practice among Sanskrit dramatists. Thus the Bharatavākya in the Mālavikāgnimitra is a very weighty evidence for the date of Kālidāsa as contemporaneous with the King Agnimitra.

4. atidayitalāsyasya ca śailūṣamādhyam adhyāsyā mūrdhānam asila-  
tayā mṛnālam ivālunād agnimitrātmajasya sumitrasya mitradevaḥ.
5. The following passages may be quoted :
  - (a) Harṣacarita : aripure ca parakalatrakāmukam kāmīnīveṣaguptaś  
candraguptaḥ śakapatim aśātayat. Its commentary : śakānām  
ācāryaś śakapatiḥ. sa candraguptabhṛtrjāyām dhruvadevīm  
prārthayamānaś candraguptena dhruvadevīveṣadhārinā strīveṣa-  
janaparivṛtena rahasi vyāpāditaḥ.
  - (b) Kāvya-mīmāṃsā : datvā ruddhagatiḥ śakādhipataye devīm dhruva-  
svāminīm yasmāt khaṇḍitasāhaso nivavṛte srī rāmagupto (śarma-  
gupto) nrpaḥ.

It is not merely the occurrence of the name of the hero of the drama, namely, Agnimitra that comes in as evidence for the postulate that Kālidāsa wrote the drama at the time when Agnimitra was the king. No one who reads the drama can fail to note that it is unique in many ways. The uniqueness of the Bharatavākya, or rather, I would say the absence of a Bharatavākya in the drama, has already been dealt with. In the next Paper I am giving many points that show that when Kālidāsa wrote his works, he had in his mind many events of a historical nature that occurred at the time or just prior to the time when Agnimitra was the king. Individually none of these points can prove anything. But all the points put together are enough to make out a case in favour of the hypothesis regarding Kālidāsa's contemporaneity with king Agnimitra.

Apart from the technique of the Bharatavākya, the drama begins with a Miśra viṣkambha in which the Prākṛt speaking character enters as the first character in the drama. The Sanskrit speaking character, namely, Gaṇādāsa, appears much later in this scene. This is rather unusual. It is always a Sanskrit speaking character that introduces the drama. Mṛcchakaṭika is the other exception to this general practice. There, the Sūtradhāra himself adopts Prākṛt at a certain stage in the prologue, while in all the dramas, the Sūtradhāra speaks Sanskrit. Then it is the Vidūṣaka that appears in the opening of the first Act, and he speaks Prākṛt. But every one who has carefully studied the Mṛcchakaṭika knows that there all the rules of dramaturgy are thrown to the winds. It is more or less a parody, in the technique, in the hero, in his relation to the heroine, in the minor characters and in the development of the plot. At the same time it is a serious drama full of pathos. But this is another story. The point here is that in the Mālavikāgnimitra there is a slight departure from the usual conventions of drama in regard to the opening of the work.

As regards the characters, we find that in the other two dramas Kālidāsa is more or less conventional. Duṣṇanta is a conventional hero. So is Purūravas. There is some sort of idealisation in their picture. In the Mālavikāgnimitra, we find in the hero a man whom we are all familiar with. The Vidūṣaka in the Mālavikāgnimitra is not a conventional figure but a real human being, with all human feelings, a feature lacking in the Vidūṣaka of the other two dramas.

The description of the Palace in the *Mālavikāgnimitra* is much more realistic than in the other two dramas. One has a feeling that Kālidāsa was describing in this drama, scenes very familiar to him. The characters also have the appearance of people known intimately to the author. It is not suggested that Kālidāsa was simply describing in the drama, events and personalities exactly in the way in which they were known to him. What I feel is that he had certain models in actual life when he was describing the characters. The *Vidūṣaka* and *Gaṇadāsa* in the drama are not strange persons. There is a kind of personal touch in them.

In the other two dramas there is an aloofness, some classical seriousness. When we read the *Śākuntala* we are lifted above the normal affairs of life into a realm of idealised reality. We forget our own surroundings and we find ourselves transferred into a new world. In the *Mālavikāgnimitra* we find ourselves in the environments in which we live. Every one may not be living in a palace. Yet they can feel themselves at home in the atmosphere that is created in the drama. The persons are also more of the sort that we meet with in our every day life. When I read the drama I have always a feeling that Kālidāsa was keeping in his mind certain contemporary events, contemporary characters and surrounding quite familiar to him. As a matter of fact it is this peculiar atmosphere in the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, so different from the atmosphere of the other two dramas, which first led me into thinking that the drama has something to do with contemporary affairs in regard to Kālidāsa and that Kālidāsa must have written the drama in the time of the reign of Agnimitra and had it staged in his royal presence.

## II. ALLUSIONS TO AGNIMITRA IN THE WORKS OF KALIDASA

Research workers have collected a large number of evidences in the works of Kālidāsa to prove his relation to a Vikramāditya and also to the many emperors of the Gupta dynasty, like Samudragupta, Candragupta, Skandagupta and Kumāragupta. But no one has tried to investigate the possibilities of Kālidāsa's works being reminiscent of the time of Agnimitra.

In the *Meghasandēśa* the long description of Ujjayinī is taken as an evidence of Kālidāsa being a resident of that imperial city under one of the Gupta Emperors. There is no doubt about the pro-

minence given by Kālidāsa to this great and renowned city.<sup>1</sup> But one wonders why if he had known it as the seat of the Empire, he did not give even the slightest hint to its being so. There is actually not a word about the Emperor or about the Palace. The entire description is about the mansions, about the river and about the temple. This omission cannot be an accident.

As a contrast to this, one has to see how he describes Vidiśā in the Meghasandēśa. After mentioning the Daśārṇa country,<sup>2</sup> Kālidāsa says:

teṣāṃ dikṣu prathitavidīśālakṣaṇāṃ rājadhānīm.<sup>3</sup>

Here Vidiśā is mentioned as an imperial capital renowned in all places. There is no evidence of Vidiśā ever having assumed such importance as to be mentioned as the well-known imperial capital, unless we assume that the mention is made at a time when it was the seat of a great king. We know that Agnimitra had his court at Vidiśā and if Kālidāsa had written his Meghasandēśa at the time of Agnimitra, this statement becomes reasonable. Even during the time of the Suṅga dynasty Pāṭaliputra was the real imperial capital. During the reign of Puṣyamitra, his son Agnimitra was engaged in the southern wars and he had his court at Vidiśā. The only explanation of such a description of Vidiśā in the Meghasandēśa is that at the time when Kālidāsa wrote his Meghasandēśa, he was a resident of Vidiśā and that Agnimitra had his court at that place. Kālidāsa must have been a friend of the king even from early times and must have written the drama Mālavikāgnimitra at a later time when Agnimitra had become the king, depicting certain political events of the Vidiśā days intertwined with a love romance in the court.

Towards the end of the drama Mālavikāgnimitra, there is the mention of the sacrifice performed by Puṣyamitra, how Agnimitra's

1. Meghasandēśa I—27 to 38.
2. pāṇḍucchāyopavanavṛtaḥ ketakīḥ sūcibhinnair  
nīḍārambhair grhabalibhujām ākulagrāmacaityāḥ  
tvayy āsanne pariṇataphalaśyāmajambūvanāntāḥ  
sampsatyante katipayadinasthāyihamsā darsārnāḥ (Megh. I—23).
3. Megh. I—24.

son Vasumitra, protected the sacrificial horse, how he met the Yavanas on the Banks of the Sindhu and defeated them and how Puṣyamitra entreats Agnimitra to attend the sacrifice throwing off his ill-feeling towards the father.<sup>4</sup>

There is nothing to show what the cause of Agnimitra's ill-feeling towards Puṣyamitra was. From the references to the anxiety of Dhārīṇī for the safety of his young son being sent on such a dangerous expedition,<sup>5</sup> it may be inferred that this was the cause of the ill-feeling. Puṣyamitra invites Agnimitra after announcing that the young boy had returned with the horse safe and with great glory after defeating the Yavanas.

The sacrifice of Puṣyamitra was a great event at that time and Patañjali mentions it in his Mahābhāṣya in two places.<sup>6</sup> There is nothing to show that the event continued a very popular one even at a later time. The mention of this event in the drama Mālavikāgnimitra lends support to the view that Kālidāsa lived not far later than Puṣyamitra, and at a time when the sacrifice of Puṣyamitra was still a popular event.

One cannot avoid noticing a parallel of this historical event in the incidents found in the third canto of the Raghuvamśa. Here there is the virtuous and religious king Dilipa performing a great sacrifice and Indra stealing the sacrificial horse. The young and heroic Raghu chases Indra and returns victorious after his battle with Indra. The resemblance of the two pictures is too striking to be ignored.

4. svasti. yajñāsaraṇāt senāpatiḥ puṣyamitro vaidīśastham putram āyusmantam agnimitram snehāt parisvajyānudarśayati. viditam astu. yo 'sau rājasūyayajñadikṣitena mayā rājaputraśataparivṛtam goptāram vasumitram ādiśya samvatsaropāvartanīyo nirargalas turago viśr̥ṣṭaḥ sa sindhor dakṣiṇe rodhasi carann aśvānikena yavanānām prār̥thitaḥ. tata ubhayoḥ senayor mahān āsīt sammardaḥ.

tataḥ parān parityajya vasumitreṇa dhanvina prasahya hriyamāṇo me vājirājo nivartitaḥ

so 'ham idānīm aṃśumateva sagarāḥ pautreṇa pratyāhṛtāśvo yakṣye. tad idānīm akālāhinam vigataroṣacetasā bhavatā vadhūjanena-saha yajñasevanāyāgantavyam.

5. atibhāre khalu senāpatinā niyukto me putrahaḥ.  
6. iha puṣyamitram yājayāmaḥ III-ii-123  
puṣyamitro yajate. yājakā yājayanti III-i-26.

Every one knows that for the events detailed in the *Raghuvamśa* so far as the first eight Cantos are concerned Kālidāsa has no basis. Perhaps he had some lists of dynasties and some anecdotes. But no *Purāṇa* mentions a single event found in the first eight cantos of the *Raghuvamśa*. Some epic version of the events in the first eight cantos found in a few Bengali Manuscripts of the *Padmapurāṇa*<sup>7</sup> can be nothing but interpolations into the *Purāṇa* at a much later time.

Thus when Kālidāsa described the exploits of Raghu in the third canto of the *Raghuvamśa*, it is the historical events described in the last Act of *Mālavikāgnimitra* that must have been at the back of his mind. He must have had Puṣyamitra in his mind when he described Dilīpa and he must have had the young Hero Vasumitra in his mind when he described Raghu fighting against Indra.

Some scholars find in the sacrifice of Puṣyamitra described in the *Mālavikāgnimitra* a reflection of the sacrifice performed by Samudragupta. When there is a historical event described in a drama with a historical back-ground, I see no reason in considering this mention of the historical event as a reference to another historical event. If Puṣyamitra and his sacrifice were not historical events, then there is justification for assuming that such events were suggested to the author by some similar historical event.

Some scholars find in the *Digvijaya* of Raghu described by Kālidāsa in the fourth canto of the *Raghuvamśa* a reflection of the conquest of Samudragupta; others try to identify this with the conquests of Yaśovarman. Since the *Digvijaya* of Raghu is not a historical event, it is quite reasonable to assume that some other historical event might be at the back of the narration. But one finds little similarity between the march of Raghu and the conquests of either Samudragupta or Yaśovarman. There is no parallelism in the countries conquered.

What is peculiar in Raghu's *Digvijaya* is that he went far beyond the western borders of what is now India. He reached Persia<sup>8</sup> and after conquering Persia he marched northwards to the Oxus

7. See *Padmapurāṇa* and *Kālidāsa* by Dr. Haradatta Sarma.

8. *pārasikāms tato jetum pratasthe sthalavatmanā*—Ragh. IV-60.

river, where the Hūnas lived.<sup>9</sup> There is no digvijaya mentioned in any Sanskrit record, where an Indian prince had gone so far West, either historical or Purāṇic. In Yudhiṣṭhira's digvijaya, the brothers go only to the western extremity of the present India, perhaps a little more. Neither Samudragupta nor Yaśovarman had conquered Persia.

In the war between Candragupta Maurya and Selucus, the latter was defeated and had to cede the Eastern part of his empire to the former and the empire of Candragupta Maurya comprised a part of Persia. There is nothing improbable in Kālidāsa, if he lived at the time of Agniśītra, about a century and a half after the time of Candragupta, to have this event in his mind and to have described the conquest of Raghu on the model of the empire of Candragupta. If Kālidāsa had any historical event in his mind when he described the digvijaya of Raghu, the greatest probability is that he had the empire of Candragupta Maurya in his mind.

It is not improbable that in the Kumārasambhava also, he had the empire of Candragupta in his mind. This may look rather far-fetched. In the Kumārasambhava, Kālidāsa did not merely present in metrical form a bare Purāṇic story. It is more likely that the story found a place in the Purāṇas since Kālidāsa wrote an allegorical epic. This aspect of the poem has not till now been considered by anybody. As a matter of fact, Sanskrit poetry has never been examined from this point, whether there is any allegory behind the seemingly commonplace Purāṇic stories dealt with in the poems.

In the beginning of the Kumārasambhava, Kālidāsa gives the following verse about Pārvatī:

athāvamānena pituḥ prayuktā  
dakṣasya kanyā bhavapūrvapatnī  
satī satī yogavisṛṣṭadehā  
tām janmane śailavadhūm prapede.<sup>10</sup>

9. tataḥ pratasthe kauberīm bhāsvān iva raghur dīśam  
śarair ushair ivodīcyān uddharīṣyan raśān iva. Ragh. IV—66  
vinītādharmaśramās tasya vaṅkṣutīraviceṣṭitaiḥ  
dudhuvur vājinaḥ skandhān lagnakūṅkumakesarām. Ragh. IV—67  
tatra hūnāvarodhānām bhartṛṣu vyaktavikramam  
kapalapātālādēśi babbhūva raghuceṣṭitam. Ragh. IV—68

10. Kum. I-21.

The meaning of this verse is very simple. The Goddess Satī, formerly wife of Śiva, moved by the insult done by her father took away her life by yogic powers and she entered the womb of the consort of Himavān for rebirth. If we think of Satī as the empire of Candragupta and as the daughter of a Prajāpati, the Lord of man and wedded to the almighty god, and if we regard the Prajāpati as ignoring this great empire on account of its association with God and thereby insulting her and if we regard the death of Satī as the down-fall of this great empire, I think we can see some veiled allusion in the story to the decay of the Empire under the last Mauryan emperors and their dissociation from religion which was the cause of the destruction of the Empire. The same empire, which once extended far beyond the borders of the present-day India, was revived in a narrower compass within the land enclosed on the north by the great Himalayas and this is the meaning of the rebirth of Satī as the daughter of Himavān. The world was being persecuted by the evil demons; the divinities tried to save the world by entreating the intervention of the creator. They do not understand the real significance of the advice of the creator in regard to the steps they should take to reunite Parvatī (the revived India) to the Almighty and they try to bring about this union by artificial means. This fails. The Almighty is later pleased with the New India on account of her 'Tapas and agree to be her husband once more; from this union of the land with the Almighty, India gets a new leader and the evil demons are destroyed. If this allegory has any force, the poem is based on the historical incident of the fall of the Mauryan Empire and the revival of religion and Empire by Puṣyamitra.

In this connection, one shall not miss a point which may seem rather a trifle. We are not certain about the historical accuracy of Agnimitra marrying Mālavikā, the sister of the king of Vidarbha. In the Raghuvamśa there is the incident of Aja marrying the sister of the king of Vidarbha. I would not have touched upon this small incident, but for the fact that to prove the relation of Kālīdāsa to Vikramāditya, to the Gupta dynasty and to some of the emperors of that dynasty, scholars have dragged in a large number of so-called indications in the works of Kālīdāsa. The term Vikrama, the use of the various forms of the root gup, the words Samudra, Candra, Skanda and Kumāra and their synonyms are all taken as indications of Kālīdāsa's relation with a Vikramāditya and with the various emperors of the Gupta dynasty.



Practically anything can be proved if research follows such lines. I casually ran through the first canto of the Raghuvamśa and I found that the word agni occurs four times in the canto. Perhaps it occurs more. I have not closely scrutinised the text. But a word occurring four times in a single canto can be taken to be an indication of the author's partiality for the word and I cannot be declared to be wrong if I start a theory that the occurrence of the word agni indicates Kālidāsa's relation with Agnimitra. So far as I could see there is nothing special in the use of the other words which distinguishes them from the use of the word agni in the first canto.

The following are the places in the first canto of the Raghuvamśa where the word agni occurs:

- (1) yathāvidhi hutāgninām<sup>11</sup>
- (2) hemnaḥ saṃlakṣyate hy aganu<sup>12</sup>
- (3) pūryamāṇam adṛśyāgnipratyudyātāḥ tapasvibhiḥ<sup>13</sup>
- (4) abhyudyatāgnipīṣunaiḥ<sup>14</sup> \*

If the use:

induh kṣīranidhāv iva<sup>15</sup>

can be declared to indicate Candragupta son of Samudragupta, I see no reason why the above passages shall not indicate Agnimitra.

Whatever be the value of some of the indications, no one can ignore the reference to Vidiśā as an imperial capital known throughout the world, the mention of Agnimitra in the Bharatavākya of the Mālavikāgnimitra and the similarity between the sacrifice of Puṣyamitra where the boy hero Vasumitra protected the horse and the sacrifice of Dilipa where the boy hero Raghu protected the horse. These are real indications of the relation of Kālidāsa to Agnimitra.

11. Ragh. I-6.
12. Ragh. I-10.
13. Ragh. I-49.
14. Ragh. I-53.
15. Ragh. I-12.

## III. TITLES OF THE WORKS OF KALIDĀSA

The title of the drama *Vikramorvaśīya* is taken to mean a drama dealing with Vikrama and Urvaśī. The hero is Purūravas and since Kālidāsa has used the term Vikrama for Purūravas, a term not known as a synonym of Purūravas, it has been argued that Kālidāsa has indicated thereby that his own patron was a Vikramāditya. Otherwise Kālidāsa would not have used such a term to denote Purūravas. If the term is taken as a compound with its middle element dropped and explained as the drama dealing with Urvaśī won by the vikrama (of Purūravas), the termination is not quite regular.

Leaving this grammatical point aside for the time being, we have to see if the term is appropriate to the plot of the drama. There are two references to vikrama in the first Act,<sup>1</sup> and the word vikrama itself is used in both these places. When Urvaśī is cursed by Bharata, it is the vikrama of Purūravas that was taken into account by Indra, who permitted Urvaśī to go to the earth and enjoy the company of the king.<sup>2</sup> When the time specified for the separation of Urvaśī from the king came, and when the king was very sorry over the event, it was again the vikrama of Purūravas that induced Indra to permit the king to enjoy the company of Urvaśī throughout his life.<sup>3</sup> Thus to say that Urvaśī was won over by Purūravas through his vikrama is quite in keeping with the way in which the plot of the drama has been developed and the title is quite appropriate. In the two places where the term vikrama occurs in the first Act, the use of the term is quite appropriate and indi-

1. *diṣṭyā mahendropakāraparyāptena vikramamahimnā vardhate bhavān and anutsekaḥ khalu vikramālaṅkārah.* Perhaps the Vikramāditya chose the title because of the use of the term by Kālidāsa.
2. *mahindena jṇa pekkhaṇāvasāṇe lajjāvaṇadamuhī bhaṇidā—jassim baddhabhāvā si tassa me raṇasahāssa rāyesīṇo piyam ettha karaṇijam. sā tumam jahākāmam purūravasam uvaciṭṭha jāva so tui diṭṭhasantāṇo bhodi tti.* Prelude to Act III.
3. *prabhāvarāsi maghavā vanagamanāya kṛtabuddhim bhavantam anuśāsti.....trikāladarśibhir munibhir ādiṣṭaḥ surāsurasaṅgaro bhāvi. bhavāms ca sāmyugīnaḥ sahāyo naḥ. tena tvayā na śaṣtram samnyastavyam. iyam corvaśi yāvadāyus tava sahadharmacārīṇi bhavatu iti.*

cates in advance that it is the vikrama of Purūravas that was to play an important role in the development of the plot of the drama. There is nothing out of the way in its use and it need not be taken to indicate a Vikramāditya who was Kālidāsa's patron.

If the title means a drama dealing with Urvaśī won through vikrama, then, how are we to explain the termination? The term cha (for which iya is substituted) cannot come in after such a base.<sup>4</sup> But are the titles of other dramas free from such a difficulty? The term Mālvikāgnimitra is not free from difficulty.<sup>5</sup> Nor is the term Abhijñānaśākuntalam also quite accurate<sup>6</sup> from the strict Pāṇiniyan point of view. Therefore there is no justification in attaching too much importance to the grammatical accuracy of the term. If it were absolutely necessary to explain the term Vikramorvaśīyam as derived from the dvandva compound and if as a consequence we have to take Vikrama as a name of Purūravas applied by Kālidāsa, we are justified in assuming that Kālidāsa has gone out of the way and also in giving an explanation for such deviation of the normal path by saying that the author had Vikramāditya in his mind when he was dealing

4. Cha comes in only in the cases specified in—śīsukrandayamasabha-dvandvendrajananādibhyaś ca (Pāṇini IV—iii-88).
5. Some explanations are: mālavikayā sahitaḥ agnimitraḥ mālavikāgnimitraḥ. tam adhikṛtya kṛtam (according to adhikṛtya kṛte granthe—Pāṇini IV—iii-87) nāṭakam mālavikāgnimitram. Now to take the word as Agnimitra associated with Mālavikā and not Mālavikā and Agnimitra is not quite happy. If the happier explanation is taken, then cha (iya) comes in. So another way is to take identity between the work and the subject (abhedopacāra).
6. If an is added according to adhikṛtya kṛte granthe (Pāṇini IV—iii-87) to abhijñānaviśiṣṭa śakuntalā abhijñānaśakuntalā, the title will be ābhijñānaśakuntalam. Śakuntalām adhikṛtya kṛtam nāṭakam śakuntalam. Abhijñānapradhānam śakuntalam abhijñāśakuntalam. In this I feel that abhijñāna can have anvaya to the nāṭaka, whatever the sambandha, only as work and subject, and this ākāṅksā is already finished with Śakuntala. Abhijñāna can have no other kind of importance in the drama than as a subject matter. By identity, i.e., abhedopacāra, we can have abhijñānaśakuntalam; and not abhijñānaśakuntalam.

with Purūravas. But the terms of the other two dramas show that Kālidāsa was not meticulously careful about the terms.

The term Kumārasambhava also calls for some consideration. The term means a work dealing with the birth of Kumāra. If the termination is añ,<sup>7</sup> then the name would be Kaumārasambhavam. But the añ can be dropped and the form would be Kumārasambhavaḥ.<sup>8</sup> In my paper on Raghuvamśa and Kumārasambhava<sup>9</sup> I had suggested that perhaps the object of Kālidāsa was only to describe Pārvatī as the mother and for this the marriage and the honey-moon were enough. If the Kumārasambhava had really ended with the first eight cantos, I would have been satisfied with this explanation. The great difficulty is that the end of the eighth canto in the Kumārasambhava does not appear to be a natural end for an epic. The last verse is:

samadivasaniśītham saṅginas' tatra śambhoḥ  
śatam agamad ṛtūnām sāgram ekā niśeva  
na tu suratasukhebhyaś chinnatṛṣṇo babhūva  
jvalana iva samudrāntargatas tadjjalaughaiḥ

The God Śiva spent both days and nights there for a hundred seasons like a single night and yet he was not satisfied with conjugal enjoyment. No great poet will leave off the story at such an unsatisfactory stage. The mind of the reader is left in a state of suspense. Contrast this with the very happy way in which Kālidāsa ends the eighth canto of the Raghuvamśa:

tīrthe toyavyatikarabhava jahnukanyāsarayvor  
dehatyāgād amaragaṇanālekhyam āsādyā sadyaḥ  
pūrvākārādhikatararucā saṅgataḥ kāntayāsau  
līlāgāreṣv aramata punar nandanābhyantareṣu.

7. According to Pāṇini IV-iii-87.

8. See Prakriyāsarvasva edited by me as No. 15 in the Madras University Series, Sūtra 414, p. 69.

9. Annals of Oriental Research, Madras University, Vol. V, Pt. 2. P. 36 in the article, also pp. 39 and 40.

Aja ended his life by *prāyopaveśana* on the banks of the Ganges where it joins the Sarayu and reaching heaven he was endowed with a new body far more shining than his earthly one; there in the company of his own consort he once more lived in enjoyment in the celestial garden. Here the story ends. The readers' minds are at rest at this stage.

The term *Kumārasambhava* does not imply anything more than what is described in the first eight cantos of the epic. It deals with the events that led to the birth of *Kumāra*. *Śiva*, after the death of his consort *Satī*, had retired from the world and was performing penance. But on account of the penance undergone by *Pārvatī*, *Satī* herself in her next birth, his compassion was invoked and he married her. It is only the rather unnatural end of the epic which suggests that perhaps *Kālidāsa* might have continued his poem or rather meant to continue it.

One is not quite sure what title *Kālidāsa* himself proposed for the epic. For the *Raghuvaṃśa* there is the indication in the verse:

*raghūṇām anvayam vakṣye*<sup>10</sup>

that he meant *Raghuvaṃśa* as the Title of the epic. But there is no such indication in the *Kumārasambhava* itself. In the following two verses, which close the prayer of the gods to *Brahmā*, there is the indication of *Kumāra* vanquishing their foes:

(1) *tad iccāmo vibho sraṣṭum*  
*senānyam tasya śāntaye*  
*karmabandhacchidam dharmam*  
*bhavasyeva mumukṣavaḥ*<sup>11</sup>

(2) *goptāram surasainyānām*  
*yam puraskṛtya gotrabhit*  
*pratyāneṣyati śatrubhyo*  
*bandīm iva jayaśriyam*<sup>12</sup>

10. *Ragh.* I-9.

11. *Kum.* II-51.

The same indication is found in the reply of Brahmā:

tasyātmā śitikaṇṭhasya  
saināpatyam upetya vaḥ  
mokṣyate surabandinām  
venīvīryavibhūtibhiḥ.<sup>13</sup>

The marriage of Śiva with Pārvatī is indicated in the same reply of Brahmā:

- (1) umārūpeṇa te yūyam  
saṃyamastimitam manah  
śambhor yatadhvam ākraṣṭum  
ayaskāntena lohavat.<sup>14</sup>
- (2) ubhe eva kṣame voḍhum  
ubhayor bījam āhitam  
sā vā śambhos tadiyā vā  
bhūtir jalamayī mama.<sup>15</sup>

From these indications it appears that Kālidāsa had proposed to continue the epic beyond the mere marriage of Śiva and Pārvatī and to deal with the defeat of Tāraka by Kumāra. One has even to consider what Title Kālidāsa meant to give to the epic. The point is not quite clear in the epic itself. The term Kumāra does not occur in the epic.

Coming now to the title of his other long epic, there is no doubt about the term which now appears as indicating the name of the epic, namely Raghuvamśa. But there is considerable scope for doubt regarding the meaning of this term. After a benedictory verse, Kālidāsa says:

kva sūryaprabhavo vaṃśaḥ<sup>16</sup>

From this it is certain that he meant to write an epic about a dynasty that had its origin in the sun. One may perhaps wonder

12. Kum. II-52.

13. Kum. II-61.

14. Kum. II-59.

15. Kum. II-60.

16. Ragh. I-2.

whether he meant to call his work Sūryavaṁśa from this verse. He speaks about the same dynasty in the verse

athavā kṛtavāgdvāre  
vaṁśe 'smin pūrvasūribhiḥ.<sup>17</sup>

But in the verse:

raghūṇām anvayam vakṣye<sup>18</sup>

the position is made quite clear that he meant to write the epic about the Raghu Dynasty, which is a branch of the solar dynasty. There is no doubt that the subject matter of the epic is the Raghu dynasty although he mentions the dynasty of Vaivasvata manu in the verse:

tadanvaye śuddhimāti.<sup>19</sup>

But a dynasty is only an abstract thing and a poem can be written only about some particulars regarding the dynasty and not about the dynasty itself. What could those particulars be?

Usually it is assumed as an axiom that the particulars are the kings of the dynasty. Thus Kālidāsa is supposed to have described in this epic the lives of the various kings of the dynasty. Thus there are Dilīpa, Raghu, Aja and Daśaratha as the predecessors of Rāma. Then Rāma comes in followed by his son Kuśa and Kuśa's son Atithi. After that there are many kings described in a canto and the last canto deals with Agnivaṁśa. The poem ends here.

Is this what Kālidāsa had in his mind when he wrote the verse:

raghūṇām anvayam vakṣye

in the beginning of the poem? I have serious doubts on the matter. What is the meaning of the term raghūṇām anvayam? Why did

17. Ragh. I-4.

18. Ragh. I-9. (also Note 10 above).

19. Ragh. I-12.

he speak of the dynasty of the Raghus? In the second and the fourth verses of the epic, Kālidāsa speaks only of the dynasty which had its origin in the sun. Why did he not name the poem as sūryavaṃśa? The first king described is Dilīpa. Why did he not call his epic by the name of Dilīpavaṃśa? In the great epics of India, the most famous name in the solar dynasty is Rāma. Why was not the name Rāmavaṃśa adopted as the title of the epic? And it is certain that Kālidāsa meant Raghuvamśa as the Title. The verse:

raghūnām anvayam vakṣye

makes the point quite clear.

This problem has been raised in an old work called Praśna-mālā by Hoṣiṅga Kṛṣṇa, a copy of which is found in the Manuscripts collection in the Bikaner Fort.<sup>20</sup> The work contains a large number of problems on the Raghuvamśa. This is the fourth question considered there. The importance is only in the point that such problems have been raised even in ancient times. The reply given is not of much interest. I quote the portion below:<sup>21</sup>

atha caturthaḥ—

dilīpādīn parityajya  
raghuvamśo 'yam īritah  
raghuvamśasamākhyāyām  
bījam ke (nā) valokitam.

dilīpānām anvayam rāmānvayam vety apahāya raghūnām ity uktam. tatra kim bījam iti praśne idam ābhāti. (dvitī) yasarge

vaṃśasya kartāram anantakīrtim  
sudakṣiṇāyām tanayam yayāce

ity uktam. tena vaṃśakartṛtvam raghor iti niścīyate. ata eva raghuvamśa iti samākhyā sādhu saṅgacchate.

20. I have a copy in my possession.

21. P. 146 in my copy.



After this there is the meaning of the term samākhyā and the propriety of the epithet anantakīrtim.

This reply is not an explanation. It only re-states the question. Our problem is why Kālidāsa described Raghu as the originator of the dynasty. The reply given in the work, to which I am now drawing attention, is that the epic is called Raghuvamśa because in the second canto Raghu is described as the originator of the dynasty.

There is no doubt about the fact that Kālidāsa knew Rāma as the greatest of the descendents of Raghu. This is made clear in the following verse in the Meghasandēśa:

vandyaiḥ puṃsām raghupatipadair aṅkitam mehkalāsu.<sup>22</sup>

Here Rāma is described as Raghupati and his feet are fit to be worshipped by all people. Therefore when in the Raghuvamśa Kālidāsa says:

tadguṇaiḥ kaṃam āgatya<sup>23</sup>

he must have had in his mind the greatness of Rāma. At the same time Rāma and his story are not what Kālidāsa had in his mind when he wrote the Raghuvamśa. Rāma must have been a great hero and in the time of Kālidāsa Rāma was known as the greatest of the descendents of Raghu. Therefore Kālidāsa selected Raghu as the hero of his epic. But Rāma himself did not come in within the scheme of the epic. Elsewhere<sup>24</sup> I had already drawn attention to various points that throw a doubt about Kālidāsa having known the Rāmāyaṇa attributed to Vālmiki. It is one thing to say that Kālidāsa knew Rāma as a great hero and quite another thing to say that he knew an epic called Rāmāyaṇa dealing with the life of Rāma. It is only the latter of the two positions which in that paper I tried to doubt.

22 Megh. I-12.

23. Ragh. I-9.

24. A Volume of Studies in Indology presented to Prof. P. V. Kane, 1941. P. 356ff.

The name Raghuvamśa must have been well known at the time when the Rāmāyaṇa was written. There is the following passage in the Rāmāyaṇa:

sa yathā kathitam pūrvam  
nāradena mahātmanā  
raghuvamśasya caritam  
cakāra bhagavān muniḥ.<sup>25</sup>

The commentary Tilaka explains the word raghuvamśasya as tad-vamśāvatīrṇasya rāmasya. The commentary of Govindarājīya also gives a similar explanation: raghuvamśodhavasya rāmasyā. Here the word raghuvamśa appears as belonging to the Raghu-dynasty. As the title of the epic of Kālidāsa, it means merely the dynasty of the Raghus. The latter is the more direct and the more natural meaning of the word. Is it not more likely that the author of the Rāmāyaṇa used such a term because the term in a more or less related sense was quite familiar, that is, as the name of the work of Kālidāsa dealing with the ancestor of Rāma? This possibility becomes much more apparent when we find that a little later, the Rāmāyaṇa contains the name of the other epic of Kālidāsa, namely the Kumārasambhava, in the verse:

eṣa te rāma gaṅgāyā  
vistaro 'bhihito mayā  
kumārasambhavaś caiva  
dhanyaḥ puṇyas tathaiva ca.<sup>26</sup>

When a great poet has written two works and when in another work both the names are found, is it not more likely that the latter is also later in time than two former? Is it likely that the author of the two former works took the titles from the latter?<sup>27</sup>

25. Rāmāyaṇa, Bālakāṇḍa, III-9.

26. *Ibid.* XXXVII-31.

27. Dr. V. Raghavan's Paper on the subject in the Rangaswami Aiyangar Commemoration Volume, 1941, P. 409 ff is typical of the current view on the problem. But it is impossible that the Rāmāyaṇa should be the first poetical production in Sanskrit Literature, as the work claims. Nor is the relation of Vālmīki to the work any more intimate than the relation of Jābāli or the parrot to the Kādambarī of Bāṇa.

After this slight digression I consider the meaning of the term Raghuvamśa. Raghuvamśa is usually explained as the dynasty of Raghu. But this is not quite accurate. We have to explain the term in the light of the passage in the epic :

raghūnām anvayam vakṣye<sup>28</sup>

So raghuvamśa means raghūnām vamśah, i.e., the dynasty of the Raghus and not the dynasty of Raghu. Raghus are those who are born as descendents of Raghu. Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita says that the word raghu in raghūnām anvayam is used in a secondary sense.<sup>29</sup> I have already said that vamśa must mean some particulars about the dynasty. If the kings form the particulars under reference, the whole meaning will be:

I shall narrate (vakṣye) the lives of the kings belonging to the dynasty (anvayam) of the kings born as descendents of Raghu (raghūnām).

No one will say that this is a desirable interpretation of the passage:

raghūnām anvayam vakṣye.

The kings of the dynasty are not the only particulars of a dynasty that can be thought of in dealing with a dynasty. The origin, the originator and the establishment can also be particulars relevant in dealing with a dynasty. If this is the way in which we proceed, the meaning will be:

I shall narrate (vakṣye) the origin etc. of the dynasty (anvayam) of the kings who are descendents of Raghu (raghūnām).

The problem which Kālidāsa had in mind was this. Rāma the divine hero is known as the greatest of the Raghu dynasty. What about the person who originated this dynasty? Kālidāsa's idea was to answer this question by writing the epic. And this is actually what he has done.

28. Ragh. I-9 (also note 18 above).

29. Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita on Pāṇini II-iv-62.

In verses 5 to 8 in the first canto of the *Raghuvaṃśa*, Kālidāsa enumerated sixteen points of greatness in the kings who are the descendents of Raghu. Then every one of these points he substantiates by describing appropriate events in the life of the originator of the dynasty. The son was described as just a reproduction of the father, in the verse:

rūpam tad ojasvi tad eva vīryam  
tad eva naisargikam unnatatvam  
na kāraṇāt svād bibhīde kumārah  
pravartito dīpa iva pradīpāt<sup>30</sup>

Kālidāsa also described that his son also was installed on the throne in due course. About this son (Raghu's grandson), also Kālidāsa says:

samyag vinītam atha varmaharam kumāram  
ādiśya rakṣaṇavidhau vidhivat prajānām.<sup>31</sup>

Thus he has amply indicated that the tradition started by Raghu has been continued by his descendents. At the end of the eighth canto, Kālidāsa brings the epic to a very natural and happy ending.

Until the birth of Raghu, there are many evidences to show that Kālidāsa was thinking of the dynasty when he started to write the epic. There is the reference to the dynasty, though as the solar dynasty, in the second and the fourth verses in the first canto:

kva sūryaprabhavo vaṃśaḥ

and

athavā kṛtavāgdvāre  
vaṃśe 'smin pūruvasūribhiḥ.

The dynasty of Raghu is first mentioned in the 9th verse:

raghūṇām anvayam vakṣye.

30. Ragh. V-37.

31. Ragh. VIII-94.

Then he mentions the dynasty of Vaivasvata Manu in

tadanvaye śuddhimati.<sup>32</sup>

With Dilīpa there was a danger of the dynasty becoming extinct.  
Kālidāsa says:

- (1) tasyām ātmānurūpāyām  
ātmajanmasamutsukaḥ  
vilambitaphalaiḥ kālam  
sa nināya manorathaiḥ.<sup>33</sup>
- (2) santānārthāya vidhaye  
svabhujād avatāritā  
tena dhūr jagato gurvi  
saciveṣu nyacikṣipe<sup>34</sup>
- (3) athābhyarcya vidhātāram  
prayatau putrakāṇyayā  
tau dampaṭi vasiṣṭhasya  
guror jagmatu āśramam<sup>35</sup>

The same idea is found in the eight verses:

- (1) kintu vadvām tavaitasyām  
adrṣṭasadrṣaprajam  
na mām avati sadvīpā  
ratnasūr api medinī<sup>36</sup>
- (2) nūnam mattaḥ param vaṁśyāḥ  
piṇḍavicchedadarśinaḥ  
na prakāmabhujāḥ śrāddhe  
svadhāsaṅgrahatatparāḥ<sup>37</sup>
- (3) matparam durlabham matvā  
nūnam āvarjitam mayā

32. Ragh. I-12

33. Ragh. I-33

34. Ibid., I-34.

35. Ibid., I-35.

36. Ibid., I-65.

37. Ibid., I-66.

- payaḥ pūrvaiḥ svaniśśvāsaiḥ  
kavosṇam upabhujyate<sup>38</sup>
- (4) se 'ham ijjāviśuddhātmā  
prajālopanimilitaḥ  
prakāśas cāprakāśaś ca  
lokāloka ivācalaḥ<sup>39</sup>
- (5) lokāntarasukham puṇyam  
tapodānasamudbhavam  
santatiḥ śuddhavaṁśyā hi  
paratrecha ca śarmaṇe<sup>40</sup>
- (6) tayā hinam vidhātar mām  
katham paśyan na dūyase  
siktam svayam iva snehād  
vandhyam āśramavṛkṣakam<sup>41</sup>
- (7) asahyapīḍam bhagavann  
ṛṇam antyam avehi me  
aruntudam ivālānam  
anirvāṇasya dantinaḥ<sup>42</sup>
- (8) tasmān mucye yathā tāta  
saṁvidhātum tathārhasi  
ikṣvākūṇām durāpe 'rthe  
tvadadhinā hi siddhayaḥ<sup>43</sup>

In these verses there is a very touching appeal, full of pathos, to the great sage, to help humanity when the great dynasty is threatened with extinction.

Then the sage finds out the cause of this break in the continuity of the dynasty:

so 'paśyat praṇidhānena  
santateḥ stambhakāraṇam<sup>44</sup>

38. *Ibid.*, 1-67.

39. *Ibid.*, 1-68.

40. *Ibid.*, 1-69.

41. *Ibid.*, 1-70.

42. *Ibid.*, 1-71.

43. *Ibid.*, 1-72.

44. *Ibid.*, 1-74.

There is the curse of Kāmadhenu:

avajānāsi mām yasmād  
 atas te na bhaviṣyati  
 matprasūtim anārādhya  
 prajeti tvām śasāpa sā<sup>45</sup>

The sage says:

īpsitam tadvajñānād  
 viddhi sārgalam ātmanaḥ  
 pratibadhnāti hi śreyah  
 pūjyapūjāvyatikramaḥ<sup>46</sup>

The sage advises the king regarding the remedy for the great misfortune:

sutām tadīyām surabheḥ  
 kṛtvā pratinidhim śuciḥ  
 ārādhaya sapatnikāḥ  
 prītā kāmadughā hi sā<sup>47</sup>

The sage assures the king that his desires would be fulfilled without much delay:

adūravartinīm siddhim  
 rājan vigaṇayātmanaḥ  
 upasthiteyam kalyāṇī  
 nāmni kīrtita eva sā<sup>48</sup>

Thus it would be found that practically the whole of the first canto is devoted to a description of the impending extinction of the great dynasty in which Dilipa was born and to the discovery of a remedy for this danger. There is no hint about the life of any future king that may be born in this dynasty. Kālidāsa was thinking only of the revival of a dynasty that was on the brink of destruction.

45. *Ibid.*, I-77. This may be a later interpolation.

46. *Ibid.*, I-79.

47. *Ibid.*, I-81.

48. *Ibid.*, I-87.

When, in the second canto, the king was asked by Nandinī to chose the boon, he asks for a son. It is not a mere son but a son who will be the originator of a great dynasty:

vaṃśasya kartāram anantakīrtim  
sudakṣiṇāyām tanayam yayāce<sup>49</sup>

In the next verse also the king is spoken of as being eager about a son:

santānakāmāya tatheti kāmam  
rājñe pratiśrutya payasvinī sā<sup>50</sup>

In the last verse of the canto there is the description of the queen as expecting to be a mother:

atha nayanasaṃuttham jyotir atrer iva dyauḥ  
surasarid iva tejo vahniniṣṭhūtam aiśam  
narapatikulabhūtyai garbham ādhatta rājñī  
gurubhir abhiniviṣṭam lokapālānubhāvaiḥ<sup>51</sup>

Here one has to take special note of the expression narapatikulabhūtyai. In the first verse of the third canto also there is the mention of the future progress of the dynasty:

athepsitam bhartur upasthitodayam  
sakhījanodvikṣaṇakaumudimukham  
nidānam ikṣvākukulasya santateḥ  
sudakṣiṇā dauhr̥dalakṣaṇam dadhau<sup>52</sup>

Here also the term nidānam ikṣvākukulasya santateḥ must be specially noted.

Thus all the internal evidences in the epic go to show that Kālidāsa was thinking of the dynasty that was about to become extinct and that was revived through the birth of Raghu. This Raghu was such a great king that the descendents of Raghu

49. *Ibid.*, II-64.

50. *Ibid.*, II-65.

51. *Ibid.*, II-75.

52. *Ibid.*, III-1..



came to be known by the name of Raghu. Kālidāsa uses the term *rāghava* with reference to Aja. This term *rāghava* must have been very familiar at the time of Kālidāsa and Rāma, the divine hero, was also known as the greatest of the Raghu-dynasty. Therefore he found in Raghu a fitting hero for a great epic, as deserving of being immortalised in an epic as Kumāra. In the epic he dealt with only Raghu. The description of Aja comes in only as an episode during the reign of Raghu. Thus the term *raghuvamśa* must be explained as meaning an epic dealing with the dynasty (i.e., its origin, originator and establishment) of the kings who were the descendents of Raghu. This amounts to the description of the origination of a dynasty by Raghu. A description of the kings of the dynasty is no part of the scheme of Kālidāsa.

## SOME APPAYYA DIKṢITAS

By

DR. V. RAGHAVAN, M.A., Ph.D.

### APPAYYAS II AND III

Of Appayya Dikṣitas II and III, I have spoken in a paper presented to the Xth All-India Oriental Conference (Tirupati), and printed in the Proceedings of that Conference. It is with reference to Appayya III that I am referring to that paper here. Appayya II was the second son of Āccān, brother of Appayya I; his elder brother was Nārāyaṇa, two of whose sons were Nilakaṇṭha Dikṣita (wrote the Nilakaṇṭha vijaya campū in A.D. 1638) and Appayya III; Appayya III became the adopted son of Appayya II. Appayya II wrote :

Alaṅkāra Tilaka (Alaṅ)

Duṣyanta Carita (Kāvya)

Rukmiṇī pariṇaya (Nāṭaka).

Of the writings of Appayya III, I have mentioned in the article referred to above the following works:

Tantrasiddhāntadīpikā (Mīm)

Durūha Śikṣā (Mīm)

Prākṛtamāṇi dīpa (Prākṛt gram)

Vasumatī citrasena (Nāṭaka).

I have also said that this Appayya is probably the author also of the Citramīmāṃsā doṣadhikkāra and the Prasiddha śabda saṁskāra of which latter there is a manuscript in Adyar. Appayya III was patronised by Cinna Bomma, a Poligar under Cokkanātha Nāyak of Madura (1659-1682) and I have also drawn attention to a musical poem, Saṅgīta Rāghava, of Cinna Bomma, son of Nalla Bomma, (Manuscript in the Tanjore Library, Des. Cat. No. 10783), which may also be a work of Appayya III, if the two Cinna Bommas are identical.

## THE ATIDEŚALAKṢANA PUNARĀKṢEPA

We are on firmer ground when we take a *Mimāṃsā* tract, the *Atideśalakṣaṇapunarākṣeṣa*, as a work of this Appayya III. There is a manuscript of this work in the Adyar Library and represents the answer of somebody to an objection raised by one to Khaṇḍadeva's definition of *Atideśa*, and to which answer again Appayya III raises objections. The manuscript is thus in two parts, the anonymous answer and the further critique by Appayya III. See Adyar Catalogue II, p. 131b.

Beginning : श्रीरामचन्द्राय नमः । अतिदेशो नाम यः पदार्थः \* \*  
(Khaṇḍadeva's lakṣaṇa is quoted and explained) (leaf 4 b).  
इयं निरुक्तिः भाट्टदीपिकायामकारि यः पदार्थो यादृशोपकारद्वारेण \* \* \*  
इति । अत्र वाक्यसमन्वयो यथाश्रुतपदकृत्यानि तत्रैव द्रष्टव्यानि । यस्तत्रभवतां  
विद्वद्भ्यर्मूर्धन्यानामाक्षेपः, तत्र कोऽहं खण्डमतिः समाधाता, तथापि भवद्भ्या-  
न्नपरिपाकोद्भरः कश्चाद.....ख्यते । \* \* \*

End of 9th leaf (a) top

\* \* तस्य प्रकृतिभावनाम्बितत्वादिति न कोऽपि विरोध इति  
संक्षेपः । इति खण्डदेवकृतातिदेशलक्षणदूषणोद्धारः ।

Then begins the *Atideśalakṣaṇapunarākṣeṣa* of Appayya III with his characteristic *Maṅgala śloka* :

श्रीरामचन्द्राय नमः । अप्पय्यदीक्षिणेन्द्रान् \* \* विद्वद्विद्व-  
द्विभाजकोपाधौ ॥ यः पदार्थो यादृशोपकारकद्वारा यदङ्गत्वेनावधारितः \*  
\* \* इत्यतिदेशलक्षणं पदकृत्यानि च भाट्टदीपिकायामुपपादितानि ।

End of 15th leaf (a) :

\* \* अतिदेशस्यैव आदेशकत्वापत्त्या तन्निर्वचनार्थप्रवृत्तेः मुधात्व-  
प्रसंगादिति दिक् । इत्यप्पय्यदीक्षितस्य कृतो (?) अतिदेशलक्षणस्य पुनराक्षेपः ।  
श्रीरामचन्द्राय नमः । \* \* श्रीमीनाक्षीसुन्दरेश्वराभ्यां नमः ।

APPAYYA DIKṢITA, AUTHOR OF THE JAYOLLĀSANIDHI

A *Jayollāsanidhi* is included by scholars in their lists of the works of the great Appayya Dikṣita (I), son of Rangārājādharin.

This is a mistake, for the Appayya who wrote Jayollāsanidhi is different. The Jayollāsanidhi is a commentary from the Śaiva point of view on select portions of the Bhāgavata. A manuscript of it is now deposited in the India Office and has been described by Dr. Keith in his India Office Catalogue, Part II, under No. 6742. It can be seen from Keith's description that the author of the Jayollāsanidhi belonged to the Śrīvatsagotra and was the son of Śrīnivāsādhvarin, whereas the great Appayya was of the Bharadvāja Gotra and son of Raṅgarājādhvarin.

Colophon :—

इति श्रीवत्सान्वयवार्धिकौस्तुभस्य अनवद्यविद्याचिलसितस्य पाँचत्र-  
तरचरित्रपवित्रमूर्तेः श्रीनिवासाध्वरिणस्सूनोः अप्पय्यदीक्षितस्य सन्ततहृदय-  
कमलभवनविहरमाणेन आदित्यमण्डलान्तर्वर्तिना भगवता शिवेन विरचितायां  
श्रीभागवतव्याख्यायां जयोद्धासनिधि(ध्या)व्याख्यायां प्रथमस्कन्धे प्रथ(न)माध्यायः।

APPAYYA, AUTHOR OF A DAŚAKUMĀRAKATHĀ SĀRA

An epitome of the Daśakumāracarita is similarly included in the lists of the works of Appayya Dikṣita I. This again is a mistake. Of this work, the Daśakumārakathāsāra, there are two manuscripts, one in the Asiatic Society of Bengal, (Cat. VII, 5383), and another in the India Office, (Cat. Part I, Eggeling, No. 4068). This work seems to have appeared also in print from Serampore in 1804 as an appendix to an edition of the Hitopadeśa. That its author Appayya is different from Appayya Dikṣita I can be known from the extracts in the ASB and IO Catalogues. This Appayya who salutes Gaṇeśa, calls himself "Appayya Mantrin".

श्रीगणेश्वरमाराध्य श्रीमदप्पय्यमन्त्रिणा ।

दशानां च कुमाराणां कथासारो विरच्यते ॥

APPAYYA DĪKṢITA, AUTHOR OF THE TĀNTRIKA MĪMAMSA

The Tāntrika Mīmāṃsā is another work included in the lists of the works of Appayya Dikṣita I, and *apparently* this is correct, for the colophon in the work speaks of its author as the great Appayya. But an examination of the work will show clearly that

the colophon is misleading and that it is wrong to ascribe it to Appayya I.

A manuscript of the work is available in the Madras Government Oriental Manuscript Library (Trien. Cat. R. No. 6812). The work deals with the lowliness of the caste of the temple priests called Śivadviṣas whom some Śaivas claim to be superior-class Brahmans descended from Śiva Himself. The work is in Kārikās and Vṛtti. For the following reasons, it is not likely that the author of this work is Appayya I. The work quotes the *Smṛtimuktāvali* (-muktāphala) of Vaidyanātha Dikṣita and the *Mīmāṃsā* writer Somanātha; the latter is the author of the *Mayūkhamālikā* on the *Śāstra dīpikā* and himself quotes the *Vidhirasāyana* of Appayya I. Further, while the great Appayya was a Śaiva, the author of this work is one who denies the supremacy of Śiva and upholds *Haripāramya* (see towards the end of the work).

# MINOR WORKS WRONGLY ASCRIBED TO ĀDI ŚANKARA

By

DR. V. RAGHAVAN, M.A., PH.D.

I. SARVA VEDĀNTA SIDDHĀNTA SĀRA SAMGRAHA

OR

VEDĀNTA ŚĀSTRA SIDDHĀNTA SAMGRAHA

OR

VEDĀNTA SĀRA SAMGRAHA

In Vol. 15 of the Śrī Vāṇī Vilās Press edition of the works of Śrī (Ādi) Śaṅkarācārya is included (pp. 103-258) a minor work, ascribed to Sri (Ādi) Śaṅkara, called the Sarva Vedānta Siddhānta Sāra Saṁgraha, in about 1,000 verses, mostly in Anuṣṭubhs, but here and there in the longer metres also. In the course of my discussion of the date of the Yogavāsiṣṭha, I drew attention to the presence in this minor work of verses belonging to the Yogavāsiṣṭha, (see *JOR*, Madras, Vol. XIII, p. 120); and made the suggestion that this minor work was not likely to be a work of Śaṅkara.

In the Madras Government Oriental Library, there is a manuscript of this work with the name Vedānta Śāstra Siddhānta Saṁgraha, bearing R. No. 1939 (d.); there is a manuscript of this work with the name Vedānta Sāra Saṁgraha in the Adyar Library, Madras, noted on p. 150a of Vol. II of the Adyar Catalogue,<sup>1</sup> and bearing the Library Shelf No. 35 B 106; there is a third manuscript of this work in the Library of the Curator, at Trivandrum, described under No. 366 (pp. 831-2) in Vol. III of the Curator's Office Catalogue, and bearing the same name as the Madras manuscript. Now, these three manuscripts clearly show us that the work is not (Ādi) Śaṅkara's.

1. The Catalogue would appear to mention two manuscripts of this work at Adyar, but examination shows only one manuscript, 35 B 106; the next 40 G 4 has to be taken under the next entry, Vedānta Sāra Saṁgraha of Śivārāma Bhaṭṭa.

The Adyar manuscript has a few verses not to be traced in the Vāṇī Vilās edition. We find that in the Adyar manuscript, the work is divided into ten Śatakas. All the three manuscripts mentioned above, Madras, Adyar and Trivandrum have a few additional stanzas at the end of the work which are not to be found in the Vāṇī Vilās edition.

The Adyar manuscript has the following as the last verse and colophon :

श्रीगुरुनन्दनानन्दान् सदानन्दं च तद्गुरुम् ।

तद्गुरुं शङ्करानन्दं प्रणमामि पुनः पुनः ॥

इति श्री परमहंसपरिव्राजकचार्य श्रीमद्व्यानन्दसरस्वतीकृतो  
वेदान्तसारसंग्रहः समाप्तः ॥

The Madras manuscript closes thus :

श्रीगुरुनन्दनानन्द (दान्) सदानन्दाश्च तद्गुरुन् ।

(तद्) गुरुं शङ्करानन्दं प्रणमामि पुनः पुनः ॥

इति श्री श्रीमद्व्यानन्दसरस्वतीशिष्य सदानन्दसरस्वतीकृतो  
वेदान्तशास्त्रसिद्धान्तसारसंग्रहः समाप्तः ॥

The Trivandrum manuscript reads the last verse and colophon as they are found in the Madras manuscript.

While the Adyar manuscript gives Advayānanda as the author of the work, the two other manuscripts give Sadānanda, the pupil of Advayānanda, as the author. We know that a Sadānanda, pupil of an Advayānanda, wrote the well-known Vedāntasāra. It is very likely that this work also is by the same Sadānanda,

who came after Vidyāraṇya.<sup>2</sup> That the two Sadānandas, the author of the Vedāntasāra and the author of this Vedāntasāra-saṁgraha are identical is also proved by verse three at the beginning of the work in all the three manuscripts mentioned above.

अर्थतोऽप्यद्वयानन्दमतोतद्वैतलक्षणम् ।

आत्माराममहं वन्दे श्रीगुरुं शिवविग्रहम् ॥

the first line of which is common with that of the second verse at the beginning of the Vedāntasāra. This verse also is not found in the Vāṇī Vilās text.

According to the last verse of the Vedānta Sāra Saṁgraha, the following will be the Guruparamparā of the author :

Śaṅkarānanda

|

Sadānanda (A)

|

Advayānanda

|

Sadānanda (B)

(Vedānta Sāra and Vedānta Sāra Saṁgraha)

We know of a Śaṅkarānanda whom Rāmakṛṣṇa, commentator on the Pañcadāśī salutes ; and since Rāmakṛṣṇa describes himself as a pupil of Bhāratitīrtha and Vidyāraṇya, we may take Śaṅkarānanda to be a contemporary of Bhāratitīrtha and Vidyāraṇya. A.D. 1385 is the latest date of Vidyāraṇya ; if the Śaṅkarānanda mentioned by Sadānanda is identical with the Śaṅkarānanda mentioned by Rāmakṛṣṇa, we may place Sadānanda, the author of the Vedāntasāra and the Sarva Vedānta Siddhānta Sāra Saṁgraha, in the later half of the 15th century A.D.

## II. THE PRABODHA SUDHAKARA

This is a minor work in Āryās included among (Ādi) Śaṅkara's Works in the Vāṇī Vilās edition of Śaṅkara's Works (Vol.

2. See Prof. M. Hiriyanna, *Vedānta Sāra*, (Oriental Book Agency, Poona), Notes, p. 17.



16 pp. 1-39). That it is a late work and that its real author is Daivajña Sūryapaṇḍita, the poet and astronomer (born A.D. 1507) has been pointed out by me in my article on the Nṛsimha Campū of Sūryapaṇḍita in the Adyar Library Bulletin, Vol. I, part i, pp. 43-44.

# TUḤFAT-AL-MUJĀHIDĪN

AN

HISTORICAL WORK

IN

THE ARABIC LANGUAGE

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH

BY

S. MUHAMMAD HUSAYN NAINAR

M.A., LL.B. (ALIGARH), PH.D. (LONDON),

*Head of the Department of Arabic, Persian and Urdu,*



## PREFACE

It seems almost unnecessary to state that the *Tuhfat-al-Mujāhidīn* has already been done into English by Lieut. M. J. Rowlandson so early as 1833 A.D.<sup>1</sup> But few books have fallen into oblivion as this one. Not only Arabists have almost forgotten this work, but the geographical information provided by it, has not been fully utilised in any scheme of study of the ancient seaports of Southern India, though, not infrequently, some passing reference to this work is made by scholars.

The translation now offered to the public was begun many years ago, but its progress was so retarded by difficulties of text and other causes that it could not be got out in a form ready for publication. During the visit of the present translator to England about three years ago, he had the opportunity to consult two other texts of the same work in the India Office Library, London, and collate his copy with them. Yet the text was not at all satisfactory in regard to the quotations from the Qurān and *Traditions* of the Prophet. Even a recent edition<sup>2</sup> of this work was published without the First Chapter which abounds in quotations from the Qurān and *Traditions*.

The translator first set himself to the task of examining the accuracy of the text pertaining to the First Chapter, with good and reliable editions of books on *Traditions* and also checked the references to the verses of the Qurān.

1. Lieut. M. J. Rowlandson, Cor. M.R.A.S., Persian Interpreter to the Head-quarters of the army, Fort St. George, translated the work into English. It was printed by J. L. Cox & Son, 75, Great Queen Street, London, for the Oriental Translation Fund of Great Britain and Ireland, and sold by John Murray, Albemarle Street, and Parbury, Allen & Co., Leadenhall Street, London, 1833 A.D.

2. The Arabic text was edited by Ḥakīm Shamsullāh Qādirī, Hyderabad, Deccan, 1931.

Alongside of the difficulty in regard to the text of *Traditions*, the presence of a large number of place names, mostly of Dravidian origin, deterred the scholars from taking to the work wholeheartedly. These names are transliterated in Arabic in a singularly crude and obscure form in all the available copies in India and England, and their identification becomes very difficult. A familiar acquaintance with Dravidian languages and also with the geographical information supplied by the Arabic literature is absolutely necessary to arrive at proper conclusions in regard to the identification of these place names. Whatever the present translator has achieved in that direction, he owes it to the results of his study of the Arab geographers, and a large portion of his conclusions regarding place names would not have been possible without the information collected for the study mentioned above. In justification of these conclusions in the present book, the translator would refer the kind reader to his work *Arabs' Knowledge of Southern India*<sup>3</sup> and especially the first chapter on *Geography*. These conclusions would not only give information about a place, whose original name has undergone a curious change in the mouths of Arab navigators and merchants and remained all these years a puzzle to scholars, but would, it is believed, promote further study to secure accuracy about the identification. No doubt mistakes might have crept in, but as far as the information at the translator's disposal and his ability to use it go, his identification about place names may be taken as fairly correct.

Now a few words may be said about the work. Although the *Tuhfat-al-Mujāhidīn*, is a brief narrative, it is remarkable for the information contained in it, and it constitutes an important addition to our knowledge of the geography of Southern India and the beginning of the Portuguese history in India. It gives us a clear picture of the earlier activities of the Portuguese in Malabar. As the account is now rendered into English, it is unnecessary to discuss or analyse the details here and it will be sufficient to note a few points.

The work consists of an Introduction and Four Chapters.

3. The work will be published shortly by the University of Madras.

The *Introduction* sets forth the reasons which led the author to compile this narrative, chiefly to stir up the Muslims into activity against the unbelievers who had invaded the territories of the Muslims and oppressed them.

The *First Chapter* deals with the merits of *jihād*, giving the verses of the Qurān and the sayings of the Prophet that relate to the rewards for those who engage themselves in holy war against unbelievers.

The *Second Chapter* gives an account of the first appearance of Islām in Malabar, and the growth of various prosperous seaports on the West Coast.

In the *Third Chapter*, the author enumerates the strange usages and customs of the Hindu inhabitants of Malabar and the treatment accorded to the Muslim subjects by the Hindu rulers.

After these three chapters, which comprise nearly half of the narrative, commences the *Fourth Chapter*. This portion is entirely historical giving an account of the Portuguese from the time of their first arrival in Malabar in 1498 A.D. right up to 1583 A.D. covering a period of about eighty-five years. The details contained in this chapter lead one to emphasise four features in particular.

Firstly, the Muslims, before the advent of the Portuguese, appear to have been in good condition, and they were treated by the Hindu rulers with great respect and consideration; secondly, as a result of the Portuguese competition, the Muslims lost their trade supremacy and were no longer the sole carriers of trade to the west; thirdly, the martial vigour of the Muslims began to decline along with their fervent faith; fourthly, the Portuguese influence became all powerful in due course.

Thus with the rise of the Portuguese influence, the prosperity of the Muslims declined. The Portuguese opposed the Muslims, reduced them to misery and treated them with contempt in almost every respect. The narrative reveals a base description of their behaviour towards the Muslims. But the enthusiasm of the Zamorin of Calicut, and his devotion to the cause of the Muslims

were always unbounded. He spared neither men nor money in fighting against the Portuguese, the inveterate foes of the Muslims. Amongst the Muslim rulers in the Deccan, on the other hand, there was lack of enthusiasm or affinity for the interests of their Muslim brethren, a fact much deplored by the author of this work. No doubt the Muslim sultāns of the period did come forward to fight against the Portuguese, but they did not make much progress.

Of Shaykh Zaynu'd-Dīn, the author of the *Tuḥfat-al-Mujāhidīn*, very little is known. His full name is Shaykh Zaynu'd-Dīn, son of 'Abdu'l-'Azīz, son of Zaynu'd-Dīn, son of 'Alī, son of Aḥmad al-Ma'barī. The term al-Ma'barī indicates that his ancestors belonged to Ma'bar.

Ma'bar is an Arabic word used for the first time by Yāqūt (1179-1229) in his Geographical Dictionary, to denote the east coast of the Indian peninsula. It is not possible from the accounts of Yāqūt and other Arab geographers to locate exactly where, at what point, the east coast (Ma'bar) begins, and the exact area it comprises along that coast. Abul-Fidā says that Ma'bar begins at about three or four days' journey to the east of Kawlam (Quilon) and the first locality from the side of Manībār (Malabar) is Rās Kumhurī (Cape Comorin).<sup>4</sup>

Thus Ma'bar, the east coast of the Indian peninsula, seems to be the ancestral home of Shaykh Zaynu'd-Dīn. Aḥmad, his ancestor, appears to have been the original immigrant to Ma'bar. Evidently he gave himself the appellation *al-Ma'barī*<sup>5</sup> when he began to move from place to place. Shaykh Zaynu'd-Dīn who is said to have lived in Ponani, Malabar district, also retained that title to suggest his ancestral home.

It appears from the work that Shaykh Zaynu'd-Dīn must have lived during the period of 'Alī 'Adīl Shāh (1558-1580) whom the Shaykh selected as his patron. Ferishta, the celebrated historian of that period, who has a chapter on *The Mahomedans in Malabar* in

4. For detailed information on Ma'bar see my *Arabs' Knowledge of Southern India*, pp. 53-56.

5. The term means one who belongs to Ma'bar.

his book,<sup>6</sup> says: "All the materials of the history of the Mahomedans of the Malabar coast that I have been able to collect, are derived from *Tohfut-ool-Mujahideen*." But he does not mention the name of the author of that work. His silence is rather remarkable.

The whole chapter of Ferishta does not exceed twelve pages.<sup>7</sup> It gives a brief account of the introduction of Islām in Malabar, and the proceedings of the Portuguese there. A reading of this chapter inclines one to ask whether Ferishta could have summarised from *Shaykh* Zaynu'd-Dīn's work? It is generally understood that even the most rigorous summary of a long account must retain the essentials of the original. But in this case there is disparity between the two. The most conspicuous difference is, while the *Shaykh*'s narrative stops with the year 1583 A.D., Ferishta's takes us to 1611 A.D. Besides, Ferishta's account contains references to the prevalence of Shāfiism in Malabar, speaks of the Nāit community, and mentions the grant by the Emperor Jahāngīr (1605-1627) to the English of a plot in Surat for the purpose of their building a factory. All these facts lead one to the view that the *Tuhfat-al-Mujāhidīn*, from which Ferishta took extracts, might be the work of some one else, and not the book of *Shaykh* Zaynu'd-Dīn. The question has to be investigated further with great care.

The ancestors of *Shaykh* Zaynu'd-Dīn might have immigrated to Ma'bar from some part of the Islamic empire in the fifteenth century, for the *Shaykh* who wrote his book in the sixteenth century, was a descendant in the fifth degree of Aḥmad, who was the first to style himself as *al-Ma'barī*.

*Shaykh* Zaynu'd-Dīn is said to have written many books and commentaries, but definite information on these is not yet available. But it can be inferred from the present work that the *Shaykh* was genuinely pious, self-respecting and independent. His style

6. *History of the Rise of the Mahomedan Power in India till the year 1612*. Translated from the original Persian of Mahomed Kasim Ferishta by John Briggs, Vol. IV.

7. Briggs' English Translation, Vol. IV, pp. 531-541.



is very simple and direct without rhetorical ornament, yet he is not free from the affectation of ornate style so common with most theologians who had steeped their minds in the *Qurān* and *Traditions*.

To these meagre particulars of *Shaykh* Zaynu'd-Dīn's life, it may be added that the *Shaykh* believed in pan-Islamism, for he not only incites the Muslim sultāns of the Deccan to action against the unbelievers, (Portuguese) by politely-worded remonstrance, but he has, with a glorious tribute, dedicated his work to 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh, whom he considers as a zealous monarch, hearty and persistent in his endeavour to propagate the Faith, and root out the enemies of Islām.

A few words may probably be expected here on the English translation of the *Tuḥfat-al-Mujāhidīn* by Lieut. M. J. Rowlandson, Persian interpreter to the Head-quarters of the army, Madras. It is clear the Lieutenant did the English translation about a century ago under conditions that were different from what we know to-day. Yet he brought out an admirable publication. Perhaps the critic who is disposed to scrutinize it closely will feel the need for a fresh English rendering from the original Arabic in the form as it is now offered to the public; also he will not be reluctant to admit the fact that considerable progress has been made in the present publication in regard to the identification of numerous names of persons and places that occur in the book.

Before concluding it must be mentioned that the *Tuḥfat-al-Mujāhidīn* gives scope for research on many points. The details furnished by the book on a number of leading events, have to be examined carefully whether they could stand the testimony of authenticated works published since the days of *Shaykh* Zaynu'd-Dīn. The introduction of Islām in the west coast, the conversion of one of the Hindu kings of Malabar to Islām, the various activities of the Portuguese in Southern India in the sixteenth century and such other information could not but evoke the interest of historians. While the particulars about seaports in the Indian peninsula attract geographers, the words like *Malībār*, *Ma'bar*, *Marakār* and *Sāmurī* will not fail to rouse up philologists. It is hoped that the subject matter contained in the book, will, by provoking criticism and stimulating research, serve to advance and extend our knowledge.

In conclusion, it gives me great pleasure to express my thanks to my affectionate friend Mr. M. Abdul Haq, M.A., D.Phil (Oxon), Professor of Arabic, and Principal, Government Muhammadan College, Mount Road, who has been good enough to carefully read with me all the pages of the translation and make helpful suggestions.

*University Buildings,  
15th January, 1942.*

S. MUHAMMAD HUSAYN NAINAR.



## AUTHOR'S PREFACE

In the name of Allāh, the Beneficent and the Merciful.

Plentiful praise be to Allāh who made Islām victorious over all other faiths and enabled those who embraced it to gain mastery over others in successive ages. Blessings and peace be upon His prophet, the guide to the strong Faith, upon his family, his companions and his descendants till the Judgment Day.

Allāh, exalted be He, bestowed upon His servants discretion, conscience and wisdom as gifts, provided them amply with whatever they need, and showed them clearly what to do to obtain success in life. He sent unto His servants messengers to preach and admonish, to imbue them with knowledge of Allāh and to guide them.

Allāh conferred dignity upon us, Muslims, by bringing us within the fold of Muḥammad, the chosen, and thus exalted us over other nations.

Allāh, exalted be He, says:

“You are the best of peoples evolved for mankind.”<sup>1</sup>

The Apostle of Allāh (peace be on him) said: “I am the Chief among the sons of Adam, and it is not a source of pride.”

As he is the Chief among the sons of Adam, he is the most excellent of all, and the exaltation of his nation is a consequence of his pre-eminence.

Imām Aḥmad relates on the authority of Miqdād that he heard the Prophet declare: “There shall not remain on the surface of the earth any house built of mud or of hair, but that Allāh will cause the *kalīma* of Islām enter it either with the

1. Qurān, Sūra III, verse 110.

glory of the honoured, or with the baseness of the mean. Either Allāh will exalt them and bring them within its fold or demean them and make them submit to it." I say, the Faith, the whole of it is for Allāh.

Now it is a well-known fact that Allāh, glory be to Him and exalted be He, made the faith of Islām spread in most of the inhabited regions of the earth; in most countries by means of sword and force<sup>2</sup> and in some by exhortation to accept Islām. But Allāh has been gracious to the people of Malibār in Hind in making them accept the faith of Islām spontaneously and willingly, and not out of fear or compulsion. Their conversion happened as follows:

A party of the Muslims entered some of the seaports of Malibār and settled there. In course of time the inhabitants of these towns embraced the religion of Allāh. Thus Islām took root and its adherents increased in number. The towns in Malibār became populated with them, without their being oppressed by rulers who were unbelievers, or the rights of their ancient customs being encroached upon. Allāh vouchsafed to the Muslims large benefits and they passed many generations prosperously. Later on the Muslims disregarded the favours of Allāh. They sinned and set up feuds among themselves. So Allāh empowered over them the people of Purtukāl<sup>3</sup> from among the *afrañj* (may Allāh forsake them). They oppressed the Muslims, depraved them and manifested to them their hostility in countless ways of oppression and mischief, prevalent among the people of Malibār.

This continued for a space of time, extending to a period of about eighty years, till the condition of the Muslims had reached the worst consequences of decay, poverty, and humilia-

2. The accounts in history books do not testify to this statement by the author.

3. Zaynu'd-Dīn, the author of this book has two expressions *Purtukāl* to denote *Portugal*, and *Purtukāliyyīn* to indicate the *Portuguese*, or the *People of Portugal*. The present translator has retained *Purtukāl* and instead of *Purtukāliyyīn* has adopted the term *Portuguese* in the translation.

tion. They could neither devise any means nor find out a way for their deliverance. Nor did the Muslim sultāns and amīrs, (may Allāh exalt their allies) despite their possession of large armies and wealth, care to repel the misfortune and confusion that had befallen the Muslims by declaring holy war against the infidels and spending their wealth in the way of Allāh, for they had little interest in the affairs of their Faith and had preference of this transient world to the hereafter.

I, therefore, compiled this narrative with a view to inspire in the Faithful the desire of fighting the worshippers of the Cross; for a holy war with them is an obligatory duty, because they invaded the territories inhabited by the Muslims, and also captured from among them a multitude whose number cannot be counted. They slaughtered a great number of the Muslim captives and converted a number of them to Christianity. They kept the Muslim women under restraint, had commerce with them against their will and brought forth Christian children who, in due course, engaged themselves in waging war against the Faithful and afflicting them.

I named this book *Tuḥfat-al-Mujāhidīn fī baʿzī aḥwāl-al-Purtukāliyyīn*.<sup>4</sup> I have narrated in it, the evil acts done by the Portuguese against the faith of Islām in the land of Malibār; a brief account of the laws relating to *jihād* and the greatest reward for it and an exhortation to do that duty by quotations from the Qurān and the *Traditions*<sup>5</sup> together with a brief account of the strange customs pertaining to the unbelievers of Malibār.

4. The meaning of the title is:

"A gratuitous gift to the holy warriors in respect of a brief account of the Portuguese."

5. During the life-time of Prophet Muḥammad (peace be on him) it was the custom that when two Muslims met, one should ask for news (*ḥadīth*) and the other should relate a saying or anecdote of the Prophet. After his demise this custom continued and the name *ḥadīth*, which primarily denoted a narrative or a report, has come to mean, in the Islamic theological usage, the records of the sayings and doings of the Prophet, and is translated in English as the *Traditions*.

I have intended this as a gift-book to the most illustrious of sultāns, the most noble of monarchs, one who has made the holy war his chief consolation, and holds the elevation of the word of Allāh by military expeditions as a precious ornament. The set of his mind is towards service to the servants of Allāh. His lofty courage disposes him to destroy the enemies of Allāh. He is the reviver of the Faith, eradicating heresy and error from the territories of Allāh. His main purpose is to love the learned, and to help the strangers and the weak. He is a great ruler whom the days and nights have refined, notwithstanding his young age; he is the possessor of eternal glory, in spite of great jealousies of his enemies. The noble acts of his generosity have covered the whole of the earth, and the character of his good deeds has permeated through all the quarters of the universe. The necks of the mighty bow down before him; the nobles from among the Arabs and non-Arabs submit to his authority. He is a noble sovereign, whose palms shower rain of gems upon the learned who come from distant lands; a gentle king whose kindness elevates the dignity of the noble men who had preceded him. He is a ruler who meets with victory and success, and takes delight in pure and sincere deeds, and exploits which are recounted in all assemblies and towns, while the annals of his generosity spread in all climes. He endeavours to root out the heretics and to extirpate the wrong-doers. He spreads the banner of justice and mercy and stretches out his hand of benevolence and favour. Such is the mighty, victorious and compassionate Sultān 'Alī 'Adil Shāh.<sup>6</sup>

6. 'Alī 'Adil Shāh was the son of Ibrāhīm 'Adil Shāh. He was the sultān of Bijāpūr between 1558 and 1580, and is known in history books as 'Alī 'Adil Shāh I. He was a *shī'a* and encouraged foreigners to enter the services in his government and regain their old position which they had lost during the life-time of his father. He always drifted into war, very often fighting with one or other of the sultāns of the Deccan. He once made an alliance with Rāmarāja of Vijayanagar. But when he found out that Rāmarāja was very overbearing, he formed a league with the other Muslim sultāns of the Deccan and inflicted a crushing defeat on the Hindu forces at Rakṣas Tangḍi and killed Rāmarāja on the field of battle in A.D. 1565. Very often he was at war with the Portuguese who made their profit out of the disturbances in the then political conditions of the Malabar coast and the Muslim kingdoms of the Deccan.

May Allāh exalt and strengthen the foundation of the Faith by means of his power. May he subdue the impious with his blaze and disperse their parties. May his kingdom extend over the east and the west; may he exercise his authority over land and sea and over the Arabs and non-Arabs; for, he is the leader to whose noble qualities the east and the west have given testimony, and in whose service men and genii are diligent. Love for men of knowledge and godliness is his innate nature; his exaltation of their ranks and respect to their sayings is as stated in the Law. May Allāh grant perpetuity to his kindness and justice in the universe and enable him to pour on the people of the world his generosity and benevolence with the help of Muḥammad and his posterity.

I have divided the work into four chapters.

#### FIRST CHAPTER

The laws relating to *jihād*, against unbelievers, the reward that awaits those who may engage in it, and an exhortation to *jihād*.

#### SECOND CHAPTER

The appearance of Islām in the land of Malibār.

#### THIRD CHAPTER

A brief account of certain strange customs pertaining to the people of Malibār.

#### FOURTH CHAPTER

The arrival of the Portuguese in the land of Malibār and some of their shameful acts there. This chapter is again divided into fourteen sections.

##### Section 1

The early coming of the Portuguese into Malibār, the hostility that arose between them and the Muslims and the Sāmūrī, the peace between the Portuguese and the rulers of Kashī and



Kannanūr, building of forts at Kashī, Kannanūr, and Kūlam by the Portuguese and lastly their seizure of the town of Kūwa.

#### Section 2

A brief account of their detestable deeds.

#### Section 3

A treaty of peace between the Sāmuri and the Portuguese, and their erecting a fort at Kālikūt.

#### Section 4

The hostilities between them and the Sāmuri and the capture of their fort by the Sāmuri.

#### Section 5

The conclusion of peace between them and the Sāmuri for the second time, and their building a fort at Shāliyāt.

#### Section 6

The third treaty entered into between the Portuguese and the Sāmuri.

#### Section 7

The negotiations of Sulṭān Bahādur Shāh, son of Muẓaffar Shāh of Jazrāt, with the Portuguese which necessitated his handing over to them all his principal ports.

#### Section 8

The arrival of Sulaymān Bāshā, the *wazīr* of the late mighty sulṭān, Sulṭān Sulaymān Shāh of Rūm to Dēw and the adjoining regions and his return to Miṣr (Egypt) without any success.

#### Section 9

The fourth treaty of peace concluded between the Sāmuri, and the Portuguese.

## Section 10

The enmity between the Sāmūrī and the Portuguese.

## Section 11

The treaty between the Portuguese and the Sāmūrī for the fifth time.

## Section 12

The reasons for the hostility between the Sāmūrī and the Portuguese and the expeditions of corvettes to make war with them.

## Section 13

The capture of the fort of Shāliyāt. May Allāh help Islām and the Muslims and exalt their Faith in the name of Muḥammad and his posterity.

## Section 14

The condition of the Portuguese after the capture of the fort; their great desire to corrupt the religion of Islām and to abase the Muslims.



## FIRST CHAPTER

### THE LAWS CONCERNING WITH HOLY WAR AGAINST UNBELIEVERS, THE REWARD, AN EXHORTATION TO SUCH WAR

Know then : There are two sets of unbelievers. One is the group that permanently dwells in their countries. War against them does not become an imperative duty on the part of all the Muslims. If some from among them go forth to war against the unbelievers it will suffice, and the rest are released from the duty. Otherwise all become accused of having committed the sin. The other set of unbelievers are those who invade the territories of the Muslim, as is the case in our narrative. The war against such unbelievers is an obligatory duty imposed upon every Muslim, who is strong to undertake it whether he be a slave or female, of the city, or a dependent, without the permission of the chief, the husband, or the creditor. It is also binding on him who is not entitled to *qaṣr* in prayer. But it will be incumbent on those entitled to *qaṣr* in prayer if the number of the fighting force is not sufficient.

If the Amīr invites his companions for the holy war against unbelievers, it is necessary that he should consult his companions regarding the affairs of the war, and should arrange the ranks. And if he succeeds in coming by some booty, he must first cause it to be collected and then distribute it by giving the spoils of the slain to the slayer. The booty comprises all that is on the body of the unbeliever, namely, his clothes, boots, girdle, purse and what it contains in cash, bracelets, weapons of war besides his beast for riding, saddle and bridle. The leader shall then cause to make an equal division of these into five shares. Of these one is again to be divided into five portions. Of these five portions, one shall be set apart for the common good of the Muslims, like the fortification of frontier, erection of fortresses, bridges and mosques, and for the payment of allowance to *qāḏīs* and *imāms*. The second portion shall be given to the relatives of

the Prophet, the descendants of Hāshim and Muṭṭalib,<sup>1</sup> the third to be divided among the orphans, the fourth among the indigent and among those who are reduced to poverty, and the fifth is to be given to wayfarers.

1. Hāshim, the great-grandfather of the Prophet Muḥammad, was the son of 'Abdu-Manāf. He was a man of great consequence as well as riches among the Quraysh. He was the receiver of the tax imposed on the Qurayshites by Kossay for the support of the pilgrims, and the income derived from their contributions joined to his own resources, was employed in providing food to the strangers who congregated at Makka during the season of the pilgrimage.

Like the majority of the people of Makka, Hāshim was engaged in commerce. It was he who founded among the Qurayshites the custom of sending out regularly from Makka two caravans, one in winter to Yemen, and the other in summer to Syria. Hāshim died in the course of one of his expeditions to Syria, in the city of Ghazza about the year 510 A.D.

'Abdu'l-Muṭṭalib was the only son of Hāshim, by an Yathribite lady of the name of Salma. His original name was Shayba. Muṭṭalib, the brother of Hāshim, brought Shayba, the white-haired youth, from Yathrib to Makka. Mistaking Shayba for a slave of Muṭṭalib, the people of Makka called him 'Abdu'l-Muṭṭalib and history recognises the grandfather of the Prophet under no other name than that of 'Abdu'l-Muṭṭalib, 'the slave of Muṭṭalib'.

After the death of Muṭṭalib at Kazwān, in Yemen, towards the end of 520 A.D. 'Abdu'l-Muṭṭalib succeeded him as the head of the Commonwealth of Makka.

'Abdu'l-Muṭṭalib had ten sons and six daughters. Of the sons (1) Hārith, born towards 538 A.D. was the eldest. The others were (2) 'Abdu'l-'Uzza, *alias* Abū Lahab, (3) Abdu-Manāf better known as Abū Ṭālib (died in 620 A.D.), (4) Zubayr, (5) 'Abdullāh (545 A.D.), born of Fāṭima, daughter of 'Amr; (6) Dhīrār; (7) 'Abbās (566-652) born of Nutayla; (8) Mukawwim; (9) Jahm; and (10) Hamza, born of Hāla.

The daughters were Atika, Omayma, Arwa, Barra, and Umm-i-Hakīm, by Fāṭima; and Safiya, born of Hāla, who married Awvam, the grandfather of the famous 'Abdullāh ibn Zubayr, who played such an important part in the history of Islām.

It is also said that 'Abdu'l-Muṭṭalib had twelve sons. But the names of the two sons, other than the sons mentioned above, are not known, probably because they left no posterity.

The four other main shares that remain shall belong to the captors, namely, those who were present all the time of battle and engaged in it.

It should be the practice of those who fight against unbelievers that they must, before commencing the war, supplicate to Allāh for success; they should be pious and religious reposing trust in Allāh, exalted be He. Allāh helps to succeed in an undertaking. Every one of these warriors must also guard himself against perfidy in the division of spoils. There is a great threat of punishment for the perfidious.

It is well-known that the Muslims of Malibār have no Amīr who possesses power and can exercise authority over them and be mindful of their welfare. On the contrary, all of them are subjects of rulers who are unbelievers. Notwithstanding this fact, the Muslims engaged themselves in hostilities against the unbelievers (the Portuguese) and spent their wealth to the extent of their means with the assistance of that friend of the Muslims, the Sāmūrī,<sup>2</sup> who also expended money on their behalf from the begin-

2. He is the Zamorin of Calicut. The origin and early history of the Zamorins of Calicut are shrouded in mystery. We do not hear of the Zamorin before the days of 'Abdu'l-Razzāq (1442-43). The political condition of Malabar before the commencement of the sixteenth century presents an interesting study. The whole country between Cannanore and Cape Comorin consisted of a number of petty principalities under princelings who were very often waging war against one another. The principal rulers in the area were the king of Cannanore, the Zamorin or the king of Calicut and the Tiruvidi or the king of Vēnāḍ, to whom the smaller rulers paid allegiance. They were entitled to wear the crown, issue coins and use the ceremonial umbrella. The Zamorin was a Nāyar by caste. Though his authority was questioned by the Rāja of Vaḷḷuvanāḍ prior to the thirteenth century, he became later the most important ruler on the west coast wielding much influence and power. When the Portuguese came to India, the Zamorin was very powerful as compared with the Rāja of Cochin.

The origin of the word Sāmūrī has been a puzzle to scholars. Some consider it to be a word derived from Persian or Arabic, while some consider that it is derived from the contracted compound of the Sanskrit Svāmi and Tirumalpād. (K. V. Krishna Ayyar, *The Zamorins of Calicut*,

ning. In course of time the Muslims grew weak owing to the depression of their trade, loss of their lives and devastation of their homes and property. This happened a number of times. Consequently their weakness increased, their poverty and destitution became intense, and they became powerless.

The Muslim sultāns and amīrs (may Allāh exalt their allies) never cared to take any interest in the affairs of the Muslims of Malibār, although *jihād* was an obligatory duty upon them. Whoever from among the sultāns shall wage war against the unbelievers by spending wealth and providing suitable equipments, shall resist the enemies, drive them away from the land of Malibār, and take back the ports which they have obtained possession of and brought under their rule, such one shall be well fitted for the task, and he will be the happy ruler; for he has performed, by the help of Allāh, what was obligatory on him, and has absolved others from the obligation, thus obtaining for himself a great reward, the extent of which cannot be conceived, and winning high praise from the people of the east and the west which cannot be gauged, and the satisfaction of Allāh, His angels, prophets and apostles. He has also acquired for himself the benefits of the benedictions of the righteous from among the servants of Allāh, the weak, the poor and the indigent. In addition to the reward for his action against the unbelievers and his spending money in the way of Allāh, he gets the reward for cheering up those who were feeling weak. The Prophet said :

“Whoever cheers up a Muslim in distress in this world, Allāh will dispel his grief on the Day of Judgment.” Muslim relates this *ḥadīth*.

If, therefore, such a recompense awaits a Muslim for relieving another Muslim from one single grief in this world, however trifling, how much greater shall be the reward for him who dispels the

pp. 13-15). But it is more probable that it is the shortened form of the title *Samudragirirāja* meaning lord of hills and waves. The Zamorin had also another title *Kunnalkkōnatiri* meaning king of hills and waves. These names indicate the important position the Zamorin held on the west coast,

grief of a large number of those who are weak, by fighting in the way of Allāh. Surely the reward for such a service cannot be reckoned by any one except Allāh—glory be to him, and exalted be He.

Verily Allāh, glory be to Him and exalted be He, has urged on *jihād* for the liberation of those who are weak. Allāh says: "And why should you not fight in the cause of Allāh and of those who, being weak, are ill-treated and oppressed, men, women, and children, whose cry is: 'Our Lord' rescue us from this town, whose people are oppressors, and raise for us from Thee one who will protect; and raise for us from Thee one who will help'." <sup>3</sup> ?

Besides this, there are many other verses of the Qurān and a number of Traditions, relating to the merits of *jihād*, and expeditions therein, of spending wealth in that cause, and of martyrdom.

Verily Allāh, glory be to Him and exalted be He, has said :

"Fighting is prescribed for you and you dislike it ; but it is possible that you dislike a thing which is good for you, and that you love a thing which is bad for you. But Allāh knows, while you know not." <sup>4</sup>

"Allāh has purchased of the believers their persons and their goods ; for theirs in return is the garden of paradise. They fight in His cause, and slay, and are slain: a promise binding on Him in Truth through the Law, the Gospel and the Qurān; and who is more faithful to his covenant than Allāh ? Then rejoice in the bargain which you have concluded and that is the mighty achievement." <sup>5</sup>

"The parable of those who spend their substance in the way of Allāh is that of a grain of corn: it grows seven ears and each ear has a hundred grains. Allāh gives manifold increase to whom He pleases and Allāh cares for all and He knows all things." <sup>6</sup>

3. Qurān, Sura IV, verse 75.

4. *Ibid.*, Sura II, verse 216.

5. *Ibid.*, Sura IX, verse 111.

6. *Ibid.*, Sura II, verse 261.



"Think not of those who are slain in Allāh's way as dead; nay, they live finding their sustenance in the presence of their Lord. They rejoice in the bounty provided by Allāh. And with regard to those left behind, who have not yet joined them in their bliss, the martyrs glory in the fact that on them is no fear, nor have they cause to grieve."<sup>7</sup>

Bukhārī and Muslim relate in their books *al-Sahīh*<sup>8</sup> on the

7. Qurān, *Sura* III, verses 169-170.

8. As the problems of the early community of Islām became more complex, it was usual in theological circles to imagine what the practice (*Sunna*) of the Prophet would have been under each new set of circumstances and pass their judgment into circulation as a tradition (*ḥadīth*) emanating from the Prophet himself. These judgments swayed by the conflicting views of sects and parties were naturally often in open contradiction. As there were no written records or compilations of the *ḥadīth*, the students of the Tradition faced with the necessity of discriminating between them, fixed their attention first on the authenticity of the chain of authorities (*isnād*) by which the tradition was supported. They held that every tradition must be guaranteed by some reliable person as having been received by him from some other reliable person who himself had heard it from an earlier traditionist and so on back to a contemporary of the Prophet who vouched for having heard the Prophet saying the words or seen him doing the action related therein. In the nature of it the chain of authorities (*isnād*) could as easily be forged as a tradition; and so, for two centuries every movement in Islām attempted to gain support for its action by putting into the mouth of the Prophet utterances in favour of its views.

In these circumstances it became imperative to establish a corpus of traditions which could be accepted as genuine. The traditionists who insisted on the *isnād* criterion, eventually came to a general agreement that only certain chains of transmission could be regarded as authoritative. It was on these principles Abū 'Abdullāh Muḥammad ibn Ismā'il al-Bukhārī and Abū'l Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥajjāj Muslim selected their traditions out of a mass of several hundred thousand and gave the name *Ṣaḥīḥ* (Sound) to their collections.

Abū 'Abdullāh Muḥammad ibn Ismā'il al-Bukhārī was born at Bukhārā on 21st July, 810 A.D., of an Iranian family. When he was sixteen, he went on a pilgrimage to Makka, and took this opportunity to attend lectures given by teachers of the tradition at Makka and Madīna. He then went to Egypt, and travelled with the same object all over Muslim Asia, spending five whole years at Baṣra. After an absence of sixteen years

authority of Abū Hurayra:<sup>9</sup> "The Apostle of God was asked: 'Which action is the most excellent?' He said, 'Faith in Allāh and in His Prophet.'"

'What is next to it' was the question.

The Prophet said 'Jihād in the way of Allāh.'

'What next?' was again the question. He replied, 'A pious pilgrimage<sup>10</sup> to Makka.'

in all, he returned to Bukhārā, and there he compiled his *Ṣaḥīḥ*. He died on 30th August, 870 A.D.

Abu'l-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥajjāj Muslim was born at Nishāpur in Khurāsān in 817 A.D. He went to the Hījāz, 'Irāq, Syria and Egypt in order to search out Traditions. He also paid several visits to Baghdād. He is said to have collected more than three hundred thousand traditions, on which his selection is based. The matter of Muslim's book, like that contained in Bukhārī's (with which it is identical, except for the addition of more authorities) is arranged in the order adopted for legal subjects, but without any chapter headings. It is also remarkable for its introduction, wherein the author treats of the science of the traditions in a general and complete manner.

The *Ṣaḥīḥs* of Bukhārī and Muslim have become two canonical books of Islām. They may be considered to sum up the science of tradition in the third century of the *Hijra*. Four other works complete the six canonical books to which Muslims pay great respect. They were all produced during the same period. These are the *Sunan* of Abū Da'ūd, the *Jāmi'* of Abū 'Īsā Muḥammad al-Tirmidhī, the *Sunan* of Abū 'Abdu'l-Raḥmān Aḥmad al-Nasā'ī, and the *Sunan* of Abū 'Abdullāh Muḥammad ibn Māja.

9. He is one of the most constant companions of Prophet Muḥammad. As a result of this intimacy he has related more traditions in regard to the sayings and doings of the Prophet than any other individual. He died when he was seventy-eight years of age, in 59 A.H.

10. Pilgrimage (Ḥajj. lit. *setting out*). In the technical sense it means: to set out for visiting the Baytullāh (House of Allāh) in Makka. The pilgrimage to Makka is performed in the month of *DHul-ḥijja*, the twelfth month of the Muslim year. The *hajj* is the fifth pillar of the religion of Islām. It is an incumbent religious duty founded upon express injunctions of the Qurān. This duty is incumbent on every Muslim, once in his life time, if he be an adult, free, sane, healthy and has sufficient money for the expenses of the journey and for the support of his family during his absence.

It is also related on the authority of Abū Hurayra that the Prophet said: "Allāh urges on him who goes forth in His cause that he should not set out unless with firm faith in Me and belief in My prophet. It may be that He may cause him to return with what He has given him of wages or booty, or that He may cause him to enter paradise."

Abū Hurayra says that he heard the Prophet declare: "I swear by Him in Whose hands is my being, that as there is not one among the Faithful willing to remain behind me in the city, holding his life dear,—and I do not find any way to constrain him to that course of action—I have to lag behind the body of troops fighting in the way of Allāh. I swear by Him in whose hands is my life, that I desire to die in the way of Allāh, then to be brought back to life, then to be slain, then to be brought back to life, and then to be slain."

Abū Hurayra further says that the Prophet has declared:

"He who goes forth to fight in the way of Allāh is like one who observes continuously fasting, stands to prayer and is obedient to the commands of Allāh, till he returns from his service in the way of Allāh."

"No one who fights in the way of Allāh is wounded, but that Allāh knows better about him who is wounded in His cause, that he shall appear on the Day of Judgment and the blood that flows from his wound shall be of a red colour like blood, but its odour will be as that of musk."

Anas relates that the Prophet has declared: "Service in the way of Allāh in the morning and evening is better than this world and all that is contained in it."

"There is no one among those who entered the paradise, who would desire to come back to the world. What thing is there on earth that the martyr could desire to return to the world? His hope in returning to the world may be for this: that his life might be sacrificed ten times. This is because he appreciates the glory of it."

Jābir relates: "A man said to the Prophet at the time of the battle of Uḥud:<sup>11</sup> 'Suppose I am killed at the battle, where would I be?' He answered: 'In the paradise.' On hearing this the warrior threw away the date fruits he had in his hands, rushed to the battle field and fought till he was slain."

Sahl ibn Sa'd relates that the Prophet has declared: "Engagement for one day in the way of Allāh is better than the world and all that it contains."

Abū Mūsā relates: "A man came to the Prophet and asked him: 'Which of the following three is in the way of Allāh, doing his duty: the man who wages war to obtain plunder, the man who fights for the sake of glory, or the man who goes forth to find his rank among the warriors'? The Prophet answered, 'He who fights for the glorification of the Word of Allāh, is in the way of Allāh'."

Abū Sa'id al-Khudrī relates: "The Prophet said: 'Of all mankind the *mu'min* is the best who fights in the way of Allāh and sacrifices readily his life and wealth.'"

Bukhārī records on the authority of Abū Hurayra: "The Prophet declared: 'In paradise there are a hundred dignities which Allāh has prepared for those who fight in His cause. The difference between one rank and the other is as wide as the space between the heaven and the earth. When Allāh shall enquire of you, which rank you desire ask for *Firdaws*, for, it is in the centre of the paradise, and most grand. Above it, is the throne of the All-Compassionate Lord, and from it the rivers of paradise spring'."

Abū 'Abs relates that the Prophet has declared: "The fire of hell shall not afflict the man whose feet are covered with dust in the service of Allāh."

11. It is a hill about three miles distant from Madīna. It is celebrated for a battle fought by the Prophet, when the Muslim army was routed by the Quraysh under Abū Sufyān, in 625 A.D.

Abū Qays says: "I heard Sa'd relate thus: He said: 'I was the first man among the Arabs who shot with the arrows in the way of Allāh. We were fighting and the Prophet was also one of our company. We had no food except the leaves of the trees. Every one of the party actually ate the leaves and we were excreting as the camel and goat ; nevertheless we suffered no harm'."

Abū Hurayra relates that the Prophet has declared: "He who shall engage his horse in the way of Allāh with faith in Him and belief in His promise, verily the food and drink of the horse, its ordure and its urine shall be placed on the scales for his advantage on the Day of Judgment."

Muslim records on the authority of Abū Hurayra, that the Prophet has declared :

"He who shall die without ever having fought in the way of Allāh and whose mind had no presentiment of it, surely he dies with the charge of hypocrisy against him."

"The unbeliever and the slayer shall never come together in hell."

"The most remarkable man is he who bridles his horse in the way of Allāh and rides fast on its back whenever he hears any uproar or noise flying as it were, desiring battle and having death for his goal, or one who is in regular work of breeding his flocks and herds on the top of the hill or in the bosom of valleys, and keeps to prayer, pays the poor rate and thus continues to worship his Lord till his death. Such men will be successful."

Jābir ibn Samura relates: "The Prophet declared: 'This religion will continue to exist and a band of Muslims shall fight in its cause till the Judgment Day.'"

Salmān, the Persian, relates that he heard the Prophet declare: "Preparations for war for a day and a night in the way of Allāh are better than fasting for a month and praying all night."

If the person dies in the course of his preparation, the work for which he applied himself becomes executed. He will be granted his sustenance, and is safe from the mischief-maker."

'Uqba ibn 'Āmīr relates: "I heard the Prophet express thus from the pulpit: 'Prepare for them whatever you can. Look: *The strength lies in archery. The strength lies in archery. Surely the strength lies in archery.*'"

"I heard the Prophet declare: 'He who learnt the art of archery and then abandoned it, cannot be counted as one of our number!'"

Abū Mas'ūd al-Anṣārī relates: "A man came to the Prophet with a bridled she-camel and said: 'This is dedicated to service in the cause of Allāh.' The Prophet replied: 'Unto thee shall be given on the day of resurrection seven hundred camels, all of them bridled.'"

Masrūq relates: "We asked 'Abdullāh ibn Mas'ūd about the following verse of the Qurān: 'Think not of those who are slain in the way of Allāh as dead, nay, they are finding their sustenance in the presence of their Lord. They rejoice in the bounty provided by Allāh.' He replied: 'Indeed we did ask of the Prophet about that verse, and he answered: 'Their souls are in the bellies of green birds. They have lamps suspended from the *'arsh*. They go about in paradise, wherever they please. Then they flock together near the lamps, when their Lord appears and asks them: 'Are you in need of anything?' They reply: 'How can we be in need of anything? We go about the paradise wherever we choose.' The Lord puts them the same question three times. And when they perceive that they ought not to have left Him without asking a favour, they pray saying: 'O! Lord! we wish that our souls may be returned to their bodies so that we may once again be slain in your way.' When Allāh understood that there was no more desire to be fulfilled, He left them'."

'Abdullāh ibn 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ reports: "The Prophet said: 'Fight in the way of Allāh conceals everything except the Faith.'"

Anas relates: "The Prophet and his companions went forth till they met at Badr<sup>12</sup> the infidels who came to attack them. The Prophet said: 'Rise ye to paradise, the width of which is the expanse of both the heaven and the earth put together.' 'Umayr ibn al-Ḥamām then cried out, 'Bravo! Bravo!' The Prophet questioned him, 'What makes you shout like that? He replied: 'Nothing, By Allāh O! Prophet of Allāh, it is nothing but the hope of my being one of the inhabitants of paradise.' The Prophet then said: 'Verily, behold, thou art already one among them.' Then 'Umayr ibn al Ḥamām took out from his quiver the date fruits which he was eating and observed: 'By Allāh! if I have life till I eat these dates, that period would seem to be one of long life.' Then he threw them all out, and fought the enemy till he was slain."

Tirmidhī and Abū Dā'ūd relate on the authority of Fuḏālat ibn 'Ubayd: "The Prophet of Allāh said: 'Every man who dies sets a seal to his work except the one who dies fighting in the way of Allāh. His works continue to grow till the Judgment Day, and he is safe from confusion in the grave.'"

Abū Dā'ūd relates on the authority of Abū Umāma: "The Prophet of Allāh said: 'He who did not fight, or equip a *ghāzī* or did not make provision for the *ghāzī*'s family in his absence, will have his Day of clamour even before the Day of Judgment.'"

12. The battle of Badr was fought between the Muslims and the Quraysh in January 624 A.D. A force consisting of a thousand well-equipped men under the noted Abū Jahl, 'the Father of Ignorance' marched out from Makka to relieve a rich caravan. The Muslims received timely notice of the movement, and a body of three hundred disciples proceeded at once to forestall the heathens by occupying the valley of Badr, upon which the Quraysh, under Abū Jahl, were moving. A battle ensued. The Quraysh fought bravely. At one time the fortunes of the field wavered, but Muḥammad's appeal to his people decided the fate of the battle. The Quraysh were driven back with great loss; many of their chiefs were slain; and Abū Jahl also fell a victim. But the importance of the Prophet's success cannot be measured by the material damage which he inflicted. Considering the momentous issues involved, Badr, like Marathon, or Plassey is one of the greatest and most memorable battles in all history. The victory of Badr turned all eyes upon Muḥammad. He became a power in Arabia.

‘Imrān ibn Ḥuṣayn relates: “The Prophet said: ‘There shall always be a party of my followers who will fight for truth and resist those who rise against them, until the time when they shall, last of all, destroy the Antichrist.’”<sup>13</sup>”

Tirmidhī relates on the authority Ibn ‘Abbās: “The Prophet said: ‘The fire in hell cannot touch two kinds of eyes; the eyes that weep in dread of Allāh’s displeasure and the eyes that are busy watching for an opportunity in the way of Allāh.’”

Abū Hurayra relates: “One of the Companions<sup>14</sup> of the Prophet passed by a path in a mountain where he came across a small sweet water spring. He was fascinated by it, and said, ‘I wish to abandon my people and take up my dwelling here.’ When this was reported to the Prophet, he said: ‘You shall not do this, for the dignity of everyone of you who goes out to fight in the way of Allāh, is more meritorious than of one who says prayer in his house for seventy years. Don’t you think that God would forgive you and admit you in paradise? Fight in the way of Allāh. He who fights during the space of time when milk collects in the udder between the two milkings of a she-camel, paradise is necessarily reserved for him’.”

Tirmidhī and Nasā’ī relate on the authority of Abū Hurayra: “The Prophet said: ‘The martyr does not experience the pangs of death except as the pain caused by a wound.’”

13. He is called in the Traditions as *al-Masīhu’l-Dajjāl*. It is said that he would appear before the day of Resurrection.

14. *Aṣḥāb*, plural of *Ṣāhib*, the Companions or Associates of Muḥammad. The term, used for a single Companion, is *ṣaḥāba*. There is considerable controversy as to who is to be regarded a *Companion*, and what elements make up this definition. Strictly speaking the term ‘Companionship’, in relation to the Prophet, can be attributed only to those personalities from among the earliest Muslims who were on intimate terms with him and shared his daily life, and, in varying degrees, also to his thoughts; that is to those who could be called *friends* in the *deepest meaning* of the word. But Muslim historians and theologians, have, from the third century of the *Hijra* onward, begun to enlarge this term in a manner to include in it every person, who while being a Muslim, saw the Prophet even without nearer association.



Khuraym ibn Fātik relates: "The Prophet said: 'He who spends in the way of Allāh, it shall be written down for him seven hundred fold'."

Ibn Māja relates on the authority of 'Alī, Abū Dardā', Abū Hurayra, Abū Umāma, 'Abdullāh ibn 'Amr, Jābir ibn 'Abdullāh, and 'Imrān ibn Ḥuṣayn: "The Prophet said: 'He who contributes to expenses in the way of Allāh, and remains himself at home, for every *dirham* he has expended, he shall receive seven hundred fold. He who goes forth to war in the way of Allāh, and at the same time spends money in that cause, will get for every *dirham* seven lakhs of *dirham*'." Then the Prophet recited the following verse from the Qurān: ".....Allāh gives manifold increase to whom He pleases: And Allāh cares for all and He knows all things."<sup>15</sup>

Abū Dā'ūd relates on the authority of Ibn 'Abbās: "The Prophet said to his companions: 'When your brethren were slain at the battle of Uḥud, Allāh put their souls into the bellies of green birds. They roam about the rivers in paradise; they eat of its fruits, and retire near the lamps of gold, suspended in the shadow of His *'arsh*. When they found out the sweetness of their food and drink and the pleasantness of their resting place, they said: 'Who shall carry the intelligence to our brethren that we are alive in paradise so that they may not shun paradise, and be frightened away from war. Allāh, glory be to Him, and exalted be He, replied: 'I will convey this news for your sake.' Thus Allāh revealed the verse, "Think not of those who are slain in Allāh's way as dead; nay, they live....'."

Ḥākim relates on the authority of Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī: "The Prophet said: 'The paradise is underneath the shadows of the swords'."

Ibn Māja relates on the authority of Anās: "The Prophet said: 'He who goes forth to war in the way of Allāh, the dust

which collected on him shall be changed into musk on the Day of Judgment.’”

Ṭabrānī has recorded in his book *al-Kabīr* on the authority of Ibn ‘Umar: “The Prophet said: ‘He who breaks his head in the way of Allāh, whatever may be the sin committed by him before that, shall be pardoned.’”

Wā’ila relates: “The Prophet said: ‘He who missed the opportunity to accompany me to war will fight on sea’.”

Dārimī relates in *Musnad*<sup>16</sup> on the authority of Abū Hurayra:

“The Prophet said: ‘To engage for a while in the way of Allāh, is better than to make fifteen pilgrimages.’”

It is meant thereby that the reward for engaging in the holy war for a while, is far greater than the reward for fifteen pilgrimages. The reason for this pre-eminence is that the holy warrior risks his life and wealth for the sake of Allāh, and bestows benefit on others as well, which cannot be said to be the case with the pilgrim.

16. This is a book of traditions compiled by ‘Abdullāh ibn ‘Abdu’l-Raḥ-mān al-Dārimī of Samarqand, who died in 869 A.D. This does not contain more than a third of the matter of six *Ṣaḥīḥ*, embrace, and is drawn up for practical use, in which the traditions are arranged in the order of the most immediate witnesses. It has been lithographed at Cawnpore, N. India.



## SECOND CHAPTER

### THE FIRST APPEARANCE OF ISLĀM IN MALĪBĀR

It happened thus : A party of Jews and Christians, with their family in a big ship, entered one of the sea ports of Malibār, named Kodungallūr<sup>1</sup> where its king resided. They secured from the king grants of lands, gardens, and houses and settled there.

Some years later, there arrived at Kodungallūr, a party of Muslim *faqīrs* with a *shaykh*, intent on a pilgrimage to the Foot-print<sup>2</sup> of our Father Ādam in Silān. When the king heard about

1. Kodungallūr is the same as modern Cranganore. The Jews are said to have first settled there. The Jews came to the East after the destruction of their temple at Jerusalem in A.D. 68. It is said that a Jew named Joseph Rabban received the principality of Añjuvannam from Bhāskara Ravi Varman the ruler of Cranganore. The date of this ruler is not definitely known; perhaps he flourished in the first half of the eighth century A.D.

2. The Adam's Peak in Ceylon is one of the loftiest and the best known in the world. It is 7260 feet in height, rising in solitary grandeur on the western front of the great central plateau and could be seen by navigators miles away on the sea.

It is a great pilgrim centre to peoples of all nationalities. On its summit is a lofty black rock with a hollow depression about four feet long resembling a big human foot-print. The Singhalese, Siamese, Burmese and Tibetans claim that it is the foot-print of the Buddha and call it his Śrī pāda. The Hindus venerate it as the mark of Śiva's foot. The Muslims consider that it is the foot-print of Adam, who, according to them, having been sent out of Paradise, stood on one foot on the peak for centuries doing penance. The Christians however claim it to be that of St. Thomas. The result is a never ending concourse of pilgrims to it from different countries.

There are two ways which lead to the peak. One is a straight narrow track along the precipices, the last portion of which is so steep that chains have been fixed at some places for the safety of pilgrims. The other is a circuitous road, considered less sacred.

Over the sacred foot print has been constructed a small chapel by the Buddhists to whom all offerings go, whether made by members of their own faith, or Hindus or Muslims.

their arrival he sent for them, entertained them, and made kind enquiries of them. Their *shaykh* informed him of our Prophet Muḥammad, the tenets of the religion of Islām, and the miracle of the splitting of the moon.<sup>3</sup> Allāh, glory be to Him, and exalted be He, had caused to enter in his mind the truth of the mission of the Prophet, and the king believed in him. The affection for the Prophet took possession of his heart. So the king of Kodungallūr requested the *shaykh*, that he and his companions should return to him after their pilgrimage to the Footprint of Ādam, for the reason that he might go with them. At the same time he commanded the *shaykh* not to divulge his (king's) secret intention, to the inhabitants of Malibār.

The *shaykh* and his companions pursued their journey to Silān. Thence they returned, after a time, to Kodungallūr. Then the king asked the *shaykh* to get ready a vessel for his voyage, without the knowledge of any one.

There were lying in that port many vessels belonging to foreign traders. The *shaykh* said to one of its masters, "A party of *faqīrs* and myself desire to travel in your ship." The owner of the ship agreed to the proposal. As the time of departure drew near, the king gave orders that none of the inmates of his house or his ministers should come into his presence for a period of seven days. The king set himself to appoint a governor for each of his provinces and wrote out detailed instructions, defining the limits of the territories of each so that one might not encroach upon the limits specified for the other. The story concerning about it is well known among the unbelievers of Malibār as well.<sup>4</sup> He was the monarch of the whole of

3. The fifty-fourth *Sūra* of the Qurān begins with a reference to the splitting of the moon.

"The hour of judgment is nigh and the moon is cleft asunder. But if they see a sign, they turn away, and say, 'This is but transient magic.'"

The splitting of the moon is a matter of controversy. Many writers have tried to explain the significance of this occurrence.

4. There is a well-known tradition in Malabar contained in the *Keralotpatti*, a comparatively recent work of doubtful historical value, that

Malibār, the southern limit of which is Kumhurī and its northern boundary Kānġrakūt.

Then the king embarked with the *shaykh* and the *faqīrs* during night time, and reached Fandarīna where they landed and stayed for a day and a night. Thence they again set sail and proceeded to Darmfatan where they landed and stayed for three days; then they again set sail till they reached *Shuhr*<sup>5</sup> where the king and all those who were with him alighted.

the last Cēramān Perumāḷ turned a Muslim in his old age, and went on a pilgrimage to Makka after partitioning his kingdom among his friends, dependents and relatives. The early Muslim travellers who came to South India such as Sulaymān, the Venetian traveller Marco Polo, and later travellers like Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, and others do not make reference to this fact. It is said that there is a grave of a Malabar ruler at Zafar on the Arabian coast. If the report about a grave with an inscription can be relied upon, it may be the grave of one of the Zamorins who is said to have embraced Islām, perhaps as a result of a liaison which he seems to have had with a Moplah woman. This report gained currency only after the visit of 'Abdu'l-Razzāq to Calicut in 1442 and before the coming of the Portuguese to India in 1498.

Peoples of other religions also claim Cēramān Perumāḷ as a convert to their respective faith. According to Faria Y Souza, the Portuguese historian, Cēramān Perumāḷ resolved to end his days at Meliapore (Mylapore in Madras) and went away to that place. Another account says that he went away to Bethlem. Some say that he turned either a Buddhist or a Jain. It is known that one Bāṇa, an ancestor of Cēramān Perumāḷ became a convert to Buddhism. Perhaps this Bāṇa is confounded with Cēramān Perumāḷ. As for his conversion to Jainism there is no satisfactory evidence. But Hindu literary works of a canonical character like the *Periya Purāṇam*, *Tiruvilaiyāḍal Purāṇam* and *Hālāsya Māhātmyam* state that he was a devout Śaiva throughout his life. It appears he continued to be a Hindu till the end of his life and died in the celebrated temple at Tiruvañcikkulam. •

5. From the way it is mentioned in the book it appears to be the name of a particular place rather than the Arabian Coast as Rowlandson would have it. The *Keralolpatti* says that Cēramān Perumāḷ landed at the port of Sahar Mukhal on the Arabian coast. (Padmanabha Menon, *History of Kerala*, Vol. I, p. 433). It is possible that both refer to the same place.

Long time after, a party of men accompanied the king on his return journey to Malibār for the purpose of erecting mosques and propagating the faith of Islām in that country. The king fell ill on the way and his condition was getting worse. So he enjoined on those who were his companions in travel—namely Sharaf, son of Mālik, his uterine brother Mālik son of Dīnār, his brother's son Mālik, son of Ḥabīb son of Mālik and others,—not to cancel their voyage to Malibār after his death. They replied: "We do not know your place, nor the extent of your villayet. We decided on travel because of our friendship to you." On hearing this the king became thoughtful for a time, and gave them a letter in the script of Malibār, wherein he mentioned his rank, described his relatives, and specified the names of the rulers. He advised his companions to go down to Kodungallūr or to Darmfatan or to Fandarīna, or to Kūlam. He further asked them not to inform any one in Malibār of the seriousness of his illness, or his death if he happened to die.

Then the king died. May the unbounded mercy of Allāh be on him!

Many years after this Sharaf ibn Mālik, Mālik ibn Dīnār, Mālik ibn Ḥabīb, and his wife Qamariyya, and others with their children and dependents set sail for Malibār in a ship and arrived off Kodungallūr. They landed and presented the letter of the deceased king to the ruler at Kodungallūr but they concealed the fact of his death as they had been enjoined. When the ruler went through it and learnt its contents, he granted them plots of lands and gardens, as per orders in the letter. The new comers settled there and erected a mosque. While Mālik ibn Dīnār settled in Kodungallūr, his nephew Mālik ibn Ḥabīb stood up in his place to erect mosques throughout Malibār.

Mālik ibn Ḥabīb proceeded to Kūlam with his wife, and some of his children and his property and erected a mosque there. Then leaving his wife at Kūlam he started to Haylī-mārāwī and built a mosque there. Then he proceeded to Fākkanūr, to Manjalūr and to Kānjarakūt. In all those places he built mosques one after another. Then he returned to Haylī-mārāwī and stayed there for three months. Thence he went to Jurfatan, Darmfatan,

Fandarīna, and Shāliyāt. In all these places he built mosques one after another. He stayed in Shāliyāt for a period of five months. Then he returned to Kodungallūr where his uncle Mālik ibn Dīnār was living. He then started from that place to all the mosques mentioned above, and after saying his prayer in every mosque he came back to Kodungallūr feeling thankful to Allāh, and praising Him for making the Faith dawn in a country filled with disbelief.

Then Mālik ibn Dīnār and Mālik ibn Ḥabīb went to Kūlam with their companions and slaves. They settled there, except Mālik ibn Dīnār and some of his companions who set sail to Shuhr. They reached that place and proceeded to visit the grave of the deceased king. Mālik ibn Dīnār then travelled on to Khurāsān where he died.

Mālik ibn Ḥabīb left some of his children at Kūlam, and returned with his wife to Kodungallūr where he and his wife died.

This is the tale of the first appearance of Islām in the land of Malibār. As for the exact date there is no certain information with us; most probably it must have been two hundred years after the *hijra* (822 A.D.) of the Prophet. But the opinion in general circulation among the Muslims of Malibār is that the conversion to Islām of the king mentioned above took place at the time of the Prophet upon the monarch's perceiving on a night the splitting of the moon. He set out on a journey to visit the Prophet and had the honour of meeting him. He was returning to Malibār with a group of men mentioned before. When he reached Shuhr he died there. There is but little truth in this. What is commonly known amongst the people to-day is that he was buried at Zifār instead of at Shuhr. His grave is famous there, being regarded as the means of obtaining a blessing. The people of that locality call him *Sāmūrī*.

The news of the disappearance of the said king is well known among all the people of Malibār, both among the Muslims and the unbelievers. At present the unbelievers say that he has been carried up to heaven and they expect his descent. Therefore they get ready wooden sandals and water at a place in Kodun-



gallūr and adorn that place with lamps and decorations on a night well-known among them.

Again it is a well-known fact among them that as the time of his departure drew near he divided his kingdom among his companions, excepting the Sāmuri, the chief ruler of the port of Kālikūt, who was absent at the time of the partition. When he presented himself before the king, he gave him a sword<sup>6</sup> saying: "Strike with this and act as a sovereign." He acted according to his advice, and obtained possession of Kālikūt.

After some time the Muslims settled at Kālikūt. Then merchants and craftsmen flocked there from various quarters. Trade increased and the city grew, till it became a big metropolis where various kinds of people, the Muslims and the unbelievers, collected. The power of the Sāmuri became manifest amidst the chieftains of Malībār who were all unbelievers; of them some were powerful and some weak. But the strong one did not conquer the territories of the weak by his strength. This was because of the advice of their great king who embraced Islām, of his supplications to God to that effect, and the blessings of the Prophet of Islām and his religion.

There are some chieftains whose territory does not exceed one parasang in extent, while others exercise power over more extensive domains. Of these some have at their command one hundred soldiers or less, or two hundred, or three hundred to one thousand, to five thousand, ten thousand to thirty thousand, and to a hundred thousand and more. Some of the towns, two or

6. According to the local tradition, when Cēramān Perumāl retired in his old age he assigned a small area to his nephew and gave him a sword instructing him to 'kill and annex.' This nephew later on became famous as the Zamorin of Calicut. He kept the sword given by his uncle with great veneration. This sword was burnt to cinders when the Dutch sacked the temporary residence of the Zamorin at Tiruvañcikkulam in A.D. 1671. The sword which the Zamorin has now in his possession with an inscription on it in Malayalam characters, was made subsequently. See Logan, *Manual of Malabar*, for a picture of the same.

three and sometimes more, join in league with some who are more powerful and possess larger armies than others, and wars are carried on between various parties. Although hostilities exist, yet their association never undergoes a change.

Of those who possess the largest number of troops is Tir-wadī the ruler of Kūlam and Kumhurī. Between these two cities on their eastern side, there is a vast territory belonging to him. Next to him is Kōlattirī. He is the ruler of Haylī-mārāwī, Jurfatan, Kannanūr, Idakād, Darmfatan, and other cities. But the most powerful and famous among them is the Sāmūrī. He is the highest in rank. This is due to the blessed influence of Islām, and his love for the Muslims and respect for them, especially for those who come from far off lands. But the unbelievers think that it is due to the gift of the sword by the king mentioned above. To this day that sword is in possession of the Sāmūrī, who it is believed, preserves it with veneration and respect. He carries it with him when he goes forth to battle or to great assembly.

Whenever the Sāmūrī fights against any one of the weak chieftains for some reason or other, and subdues him, he would give him some property or a portion of the territory.<sup>7</sup> If he does not give, no power can prevail upon him to do so, because of his authority, even though a long time may lapse. This is because the people of Malibār pay regard to old customs and observances from which they never depart except on rare occasions.

In regard to the zeal of the Sāmūrī during the time of war he has nothing in view except destruction of lives and desolation of towns.

7. This is quite in accordance with the practice of the kings of ancient India. The conqueror was content if the vanquished king acknowledged his suzerainty and agreed to pay an annual tribute. The ancient kings of India were not particular about the confiscation of the conquered country and the dethronement of the defeated chief.



### THIRD CHAPTER

#### A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF CERTAIN STRANGE CUSTOMS PREVALENT AMONG THE UNBELIEVERS OF MALĪBĀR

It must be known that among the unbelievers of Malibār there are strange customs which are not found in any other quarter of the world. Some of them are as follows :

##### *Sacrifice for kings<sup>1</sup>*

Whenever a ruler is slain in battle, his troops rush blindly against his adversary, his army, and his town, till they have slain them all, or laid desolate the entire land of his enemy. On account of this they dread very much to kill a ruler. This is one of their ancient customs, although its observance is not so much in vogue in these days.

##### *Enmity between rulers*

The rulers of Malibār form into two parties. One party supports the Sāmuri, the other the ruler of Kāshī. This happened because of enmity between the two rulers. When this rivalry disappears, party spirit also will cease.

##### *Nature of warfare*

The people of Malibār are never treacherous in their wars. They fix a particular day when they would fight with their enemies. They do not go back on it and any deceit in this respect is considered as base.

1. For details given by Arab writers on the subject see my forthcoming book, *Arabs' Knowledge of Southern India*, pp. 106-7.

*Custom observed on the death of a relative*

On the death of their elders like father, mother, and elder brother having relationship with Brahmans, Nāyars, and people of that description, or on the death of one like mother, maternal uncle and elder brother having relationship with Nāyars and their relatives, they avoid the company of women for one whole year and abstain from eating animal food, chewing betel, shaving of hair, and paring nails. They never deviate from such practices, for they believe that such observances would entitle them to the gratitude of the departed souls.

*Inheritance*

The inheritance both to property and kingdom amongst the Nāyars and those who are allied to them, belongs first to their brothers from the mother or to the children of their sisters, or to their maternal aunts or to the relatives who are descended from the mother, and not to the immediate off-spring. This custom<sup>2</sup> of excluding the immediate off-spring to inheritance has been adopted by most of the Muslims in Kannanūr and its neighbourhood. They copied this custom from the people of Hind even though there are among these Muslims some who study the Qurān, learn it by heart, and recite it beautifully, besides their acquiring knowledge of other branches of studies pertaining to Islām, and busying themselves in religious worship.

Among the Brahmans, goldsmiths, carpenters, blacksmiths, *shānārs*,<sup>3</sup> fishermen and others, their children inherit. They have the marriage contract.

2. This is a reference to the system of *Marumakkattāyam* obtaining in Malabar.

3. They are evidently the toddy drawers and toddy tappers. The Malabar coast being rich in cocoanut groves, they are a thriving community.

### *Marriage*

But among the Nāyars, there is no marriage contract<sup>1</sup> except the tying of a string round the neck of a woman for the first time. After a time either she keeps the tied string or throws it off; it is all the same.

4. Dr. C. Achyuta Menon, Head of the Malayalam Department, University of Madras, has kindly furnished the following note on *Nāyar Marriage*:

The marriage customs of Malabar are very often misunderstood, particularly the system that once obtained among the Nāyars.

There seems to be a general impression that the relationship between men and women among the Nāyars was rather loose and the practice of polyandry was usually associated with them. We get varying descriptions of them from the accounts of travellers who often generalise from a few stray cases that come to their notice without any reference to the social setting or background. Sometimes the travellers come into contact with the lower strata of the society, and form impressions from their habits.

The question was thoroughly examined by the *Malabar Marriage Commission*, in 1894, and in the dissenting Minute written in that connection, one of its members the late O. Candu Menon, the leading jurist and novelist of the time, has established on unimpeachable evidence that polyandry was never a general practice among the Nāyars, although it was possible to point out isolated instances among them, probably copied from the artisan classes among whom it was the general custom. A Nāyar marriage has all the validity of a sacred rite as understood and practised among other communities in Malabar and outside. It is always performed in public before respectable persons of the locality. The birth and death ceremonies of the Nāyar community emphatically support this view. In the former the father has a definite function to perform, and in the latter the son of the deceased takes his place along with his nephews. Probably the system of inheritance namely, *Marumakkattāyam*, by which the nephews inherit the properties of the uncles whose sons have no legal right to their father's properties, is responsible for the confused thinking on the subject. Inheritance is a matter of economic arrangement and the comparative merits of the Matriarchal and Patriarchal systems of inheritance are a matter of opinion.

There is one peculiarity about the Nāyar marriage, that is, both the parties to the marriage have a right to divorce if they wished to do so. This does not, however, mean that the conjugal bond between them is not of a fixed character.

The institution of marriage has an interesting history in Malabar and the changes that threw the original *Tāli-kettu* (Tāli-tying) ceremony to

Among the Brahmans if there are many brothers, none but the eldest takes a wife in marriage, unless it is evident that he will not have any issue. The rest of the brothers shall not marry, so that the heirs may not multiply and differences happen. However the younger brothers take women of Nāyar caste without any marriage. If it happens that any such woman gives birth to children, they cannot succeed their father as heirs. But if it becomes evident, that the eldest brother will not have any issue, then the next elder brother will marry.

### *Polyandry*

Among the Nāyars and their caste, two or four or more men have commerce with one woman, each in turn passing the night just as a Muslim husband divides his night among his wives. Enmity and ill-will do not come into their minds on that account.

Carpenters, blacksmiths, goldsmiths and others of that description follow this custom and more than one man unite with one woman. But such husbands in these cases are brothers or in some way related to one another so that differences may not happen in inheritance and disputes may be less on that account.

### *Dress*

They expose their bodies. They wear a cloth around the waist and keep the rest of the body naked. In this custom men and women, kings and nobles all are alike. Their women are not veiled from the sight of any one while the Brahman women are kept veiled.<sup>5</sup> The Nāyars adorn their women with ornaments and

the background and brought into being a simple ceremony called *Pudavamuri* (cloth-cutting) dropping all ritualistic details of the former deserves closer study in its proper perspective. See also the remarks<sup>6</sup> given by F. Fawcett, in *Madras Government Museum Bulletin*, Vol. III, No. 3, pp. 228-229.

5. Perhaps the author refers to the Nambudiri women who do not appear before men except close relatives, like brothers and junior brothers-in-law. But the Nambudiri women go out to temples and attend social functions in their own community accompanied by Nāyar women. On such

nice clothes, and bring them out into great assemblies for men to behold and admire.

### *Age of succession*

None but the eldest in age among them, even though it be by a minute, will succeed to the sovereignty, whether he be besotted in intellect, blind or weak or he be from the sons of maternal aunts. It has never been heard that any one of the junior brothers or sons of maternal aunts have slain one who was senior in age so that he may soon succeed to the throne.

In the event of the extinction of rightful heirs or of any scarcity of them, they take a stranger even though he is advanced in age and make him the successor in the place of a son or brother or sister's son. After this they do not make any distinction between him and the lawful heir entitled to inherit either property or kingdom. This is the custom prevailing among all the unbelievers of Malibār, both among the rulers and the common people, among the high and the low. The line of their heirs is therefore never broken.

### *Untouchability*

They subject themselves to a lot of unavoidable difficulties on account of their division into various castes, consisting of the highest, the lowest and other degrees between these two. If one of high caste touches a man of low caste or approaches him nearer than the distance prescribed for intercourse with men of low caste, it is necessary for the one of high caste to bathe, and it is unlawful for him to eat before the bath. If he eats before the bath he will be degraded from his rank, and will not be readmitted into it. There is no redemption for him unless he runs to a place where

occasions the Nambudiri women wrap themselves up except their faces with a long sheet of white cloth (*kacca*) about eighteen cubits long. They hold an umbrella (*maṛakkuṭa*) to hide their face with it, and they never part with it till they return home. The word *maṛakkuṭa* consists of two parts, *maṛa*—to hide, *kuṭa*—an umbrella; the compound meaning, an umbrella to hide oneself.



he will not be recognised. Else the ruler of the town will seize him and sell him to one of inferior rank, whether the purchaser be a boy or a woman. Or else the person comes to us and embraces Islām, or becomes a *yōgi* or turns a Christian.

### *Dining*

It is not lawful for a person of high caste to eat the food prepared by one of lower caste. If he should eat, the consequences related above will happen to him.

### *Castes*

*Those who wear the thread: Brahmans and others*

Those who have the obligation of wearing thread on their shoulders are the highest of all the unbelievers of Malibār. These wearers of threads are, again, of various degrees, high, low, and intermediate grades,<sup>6</sup> while the Brahmans rank highest of all. Brahmans again are of various ranks.<sup>7</sup>

### *Nāyars*

After these come Nāyars who are the soldiers of Malibār.

6. The classification of the wearers of thread into three grades appears to be after the communities of Brahmans, Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas who are all entitled to wear the sacred thread. Of them the Brahmans rank first, then come the Kṣatriyas, and then the Vaiśyas.

7. The mention of various ranks among the Brahmans is probably based on their distinctive traits. The Brahmans of Malabar may be classified under four broad divisions, namely Nambudiris, Tulu Brahmans, Tamil Brahmans or Bhaṭṭars and Sarasvat Brahmans or Konkaṇis. The first constitute a dignified and cultured class. They are kept above want and they minister to the spiritual and temporal wants of the people. The Tulu Brahmans who were immigrants from the Tulu country or South Canara were and still continue to be largely temple priests. The Tamil Brahmans were immigrants to Malabar from the Cōla and Pāṇḍya countries in search of fortune. The Konkaṇi Brahmans are largely traders in Malabar and have their own temples for worship.

They are larger in number and possess greater power. They are divided into different classes, high, low and intermediate ranks.<sup>8</sup>

### Shānārs

Then there are *Shānārs* whose occupation is to climb cocoa-nut trees to gather nuts and collect the juice which becomes toddy or sugar when boiled.

### *Other Castes*

After this come the carpenters, blacksmiths, goldsmiths, fishermen and other classes.

### *Inferior Castes*

There are various other groups of lower classes. Their occu-

8. The various ranks among the Nāyars are:

*Aristocracy*: The class from which ruling families were drawn. Most of the royal families in Malabar today are the representatives of this class.

*Feudatory chieftains*: This class comes next to the aristocracy. They assume different titles as *Kaimal*, *Nāyar*, *Paṇikkār*, *Mēnōn*, *Nambiyār*, *Kurup*, etc.

*Kiriattil Nāyar* or *Illakkār*: They are the intermediary class. They have no social status now. They are employed generally as cooks by the high class Nāyars on occasions of *Śrāddha* ceremonies.

*Lower classes*: There are a large number of lower classes of Nāyars called *Śūdra Nāyar*, *Vaṭṭekkāṭṭ Nāyar*, *Attikkurussi*, *Anturān*, following certain professions, like oil-monger, etc. They are also employed by people of higher castes during the period when pollution is observed. Some of these classes are considered untouchables in certain parts of Malabar.

*Ambalavāsis* or Temple servants: It is supposed by some people that these are outcastes from the fold of high class Nāyars. They are divided into a number of sects and sub-sects with varying status which they acquired by their contact with Nambudiris.

At the present day the term Nāyar is applied in a general sense to a number of classes with different status, some of which are indicated above.

For details, See F. Fawcett, *Madras Government Museum Bulletin*, Vol. III, No. 3, pp. 185-224.

pation is to till the land, cultivate it and do such other work pertaining to it. They are also divided into different sects.<sup>9</sup>

*Punishment for adultery*<sup>10</sup>

Whenever a man of the inferior caste treads during certain nights in a year in the chamber of a woman who is above his rank, she will be degraded from her rank even though the male had not had commerce with her or she had become pregnant. The ruler will seize her and sell her. Or she comes to us and embraces Islām, or she becomes a convert to Christianity, or she turns a *yōgi*. In the same manner when intercourse takes place between a man of high caste with a woman of low caste, the man will be degraded from his rank, and he will have no choice but to adopt one of the above mentioned alternatives.

*Wearers of thread exempted from punishment for adultery*

But if wearers of thread have intercourse with women of Nāyar caste, they are not degraded from their ranks, for they have made this a custom among them for the reason stated above, namely, that none but the eldest brother among the Brahmans should marry, and the juniors keep company with Nāyar women.

There are many more such troublesome customs they subject themselves to out of ignorance and foolishness. Allāh, the Glorious and the High, made these things the chief reason for their embracing the faith of Islām.

This is a digression from the main discourse.

We shall now return to the subject of our narrative :

When Sharaf ibn Mālik, Mālik ibn Dīnār, Ḥabīb ibn Mālik and others about whom mention has already been made,

9. They were probably the ancestors of the Eḷuvas, Parayas and Pula-yas of the modern day.

10. For details given by Arab writers on the subject see my forthcoming book, *Arabs' Knowledge of Southern India*, p. 112.

came to Malibār, built mosques in the ports mentioned in the previous pages and propagated the faith of Islām, the inhabitants of these places gradually entered into its fold. Traders from different quarters began to flock to these places. Consequently there came into being new cities like Kālikūt, Balinkūt, Tiruwarankād, Tānūr, Fannān, Barbūrankād, Barūnūr, in the neighbourhood of Shāliyāt, then Kābkāt, Tirkūrī and other towns in the vicinity of Fandarīna; then Kannanūr, Idakād, Barrūnkād, Haylī and Janbā round about Darmfatan, and to the south of these Budfatan, and Nādhāwaram; then towns like Kashī, Bab, and Ballaburam to the south of Kodungallūr, besides many other sea-port towns. Population increased in all these places.

The Muslims and their trade prospered because of the regard shown to them by the rulers,—notwithstanding that these rulers and their troops were all unbelievers—their respect for the ancient customs of the Muslims, and the absence of enmity except on rare occasions. The Muslims of these towns who were the subjects (of the Hindu rulers), were in a minority not exceeding one tenth of the total population.

Kālikūt ranked as the greatest and the most famous of all the seaports of Malibār from the earliest times. But its power weakened and its importance declined after the arrival of the Portuguese to Malibār and the deprivation of the trade of its inhabitants.

The Muslims throughout Malibār have no *amīr* possessed of power to rule over them. But their rulers are unbelievers. These exercise judicial authority over them by organising their affairs, by compelling them to pay the debt or fine if any one is subjected to such payment. Notwithstanding these, the rulers have respect and regard for the Muslims, because the increase in the number of cities was due to them. Hence the rulers enable the Muslims in the observation of their Friday prayers and celebration of 'Id. They fix the allowance for *qāzīs* and *mu'adhdhins* and entrust them with the duty of carrying out the laws of *sharī'at*. No one is permitted to neglect the prayer on Fridays. In greater part of Malibār, whoever neglects it, is punished or made to pay a fine.

If a Muslim commits a crime punishable with death, they put him to death after obtaining the permission of the elders of the Muslims. Then the Muslims take charge of the dead body, wash it, clothe it for burial, say the *janāza* prayer, and inter it in the Muslim cemetery. If an unbeliever commits a capital offence, they kill him, gibbet him, and leave the body to be devoured by dogs or jackals.

The rulers take from the Muslims only a tenth part of the income of their trade, and realise also the penalties, whenever they do anything calling for a penalty. They do not levy tax on those who possess lands or fruit gardens although they are of vast extent.

If a Muslim commits a crime, even though it be murder, the unbelievers would not enter his house without permission. But they call upon his co-religionists to expel him from society or to starve him, or the like.

The unbelievers never punish such of their countrymen who embrace Islām, but treat them with the same respect shown to the rest of the Muslims, though the convert belongs to the lowest of the grades of their society. As a result of such kindly treatment the Muslim merchants of olden days used to come in large numbers.

## FOURTH CHAPTER

### THE ARRIVAL OF THE PORTUGUESE IN MALĪBĀR, AND A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF THEIR SHAMEFUL DEEDS

#### SECTION 1

*The arrival of the Portuguese in Malibār for the first time ; hostilities between them and the Sāmūrī ; the erection of fortresses by them at Kashī, Kannanūr and Kūlam and their capture and occupation of the port of Kūwa.*

**1498 A.D.**

It was in the year 904 A.H. that the Portuguese made their first appearance in Malibār. Their three ships anchored off Fandarīna, towards the close of the *mawsim-al-Hind*.<sup>1</sup> Then they disembarked, proceeded by land to the port of Kālīkūt, and stayed in that town for some months spending their time in collecting information about the condition of Malibār. They did not engage themselves in trade on this occasion, but returned to Purtukāl, their native land. The reason for their coming to Malibār, according to their own account,

1. Mas'ūdī, who quotes from *al-Mudkhal-al-Kabīr ilā 'ilm al-Nujūm* (Great Introduction to Astronomy) by Abū Ma'shar al-Balkhī, has given an account of the Indian season. He says that the stormy and quiet seasons in the eastern seas begin when the sun is in the signs of the zodiac and that it is impossible to sail from 'Umān on the sea of Hind in the Tirmah (June) except with first-rate vessels and light cargoes. These vessels are called al-Tirmahiyya. In Hind is at that time winter and the rainy season; for the two Syriac months called Kanun and the month Shobat (December, January and February) are their summer months. Our winter is their summer, while the month Tamus (July) and Ab (August) which are summer months with us, are their winter. This change of season is the case in all the towns of Hind, Sind and the neighbouring countries, through the whole extent of these seas.

was to seek intelligence about the pepper-land and to establish trade in that commodity, for at that period the Portuguese used to purchase pepper from those who bought it from original exporters from Malibār.

### 1500 A.D.

Two years after this (906 A.H.), the Portuguese returned to Malibār with six vessels. They landed at Kālikūt as merchants, and engaged themselves in trade.

They said to the 'āmils of the Sāmūrī: "It is fit that the Muslims be prevented from their trade and their voyages to Arabia. The advantages which would accrue to you from their trade would be far greater if you carry on trade with us." Then the Portuguese began to encroach upon the rights of the Muslims in all transactions. So the Sāmūrī gave orders that the Portuguese should be killed. Accordingly sixty or seventy men were put to death. The rest fled from the town, got into their ships, fired continuously at the people on the shore, who also fired fast at them.

Then the Portuguese went to Kashī, made peace with the inhabitants of that town, and built a small fort.<sup>2</sup> This was the first fort built by the Portuguese in Hind. They settled there. They pulled down a mosque situated on the sea shore and built in its place a church, employing the inhabitants as labourers.

Then they made friendship with the people of Kannanūr where they built another fort employing the inhabitants as labourers. After this they loaded their ships with pepper and ginger and set

2. The Zamorin of Calicut had a family feud with the Raja of Cochin. The Zamorin invaded his country in 1503 A.D. and devastated Cochin. At that time some Portuguese ships came to the place commanded by Alfonso de Albuquerque and Francisco, his brother. When the Zamorin saw them he scuttled away. Out of gratitude for this deliverance, the Raja of Cochin permitted Alfonso de Albuquerque to build a fort at the mouth of the river in Cochin. The foundation for the fort was laid in September 1503. (See K. F. Padmanabha Menon, *History of Kerala*, Vol. I, pp. 209-10).

sail for Purtukāl, because this was their main object, for the realisation of which they travelled such a long distance.

After a year they returned with four vessels, landed at Kashī and Kannanūr where they filled their ships with pepper and ginger and set sail for their native land.

Two years after, they came back to Hind with twenty or twenty-one or twenty-two or eighteen vessels, and having laden their ships with pepper, ginger and such other merchandise, they returned to their own country.

Thus their affairs assumed great importance. Then the Sāmūrī attacked Kashī,<sup>3</sup> and according to his wont destroyed whatever he came across. He slew two or three of the chieftains, and returned to Kālikūt. The Sāmūrī killed them because of their association with the Portuguese. The nephews of the chieftains who were slain by the Sāmūrī, unlike other relatives, usurped the throne of Kashī and the neighbouring places with the aid of the Portuguese, contrary to the time-honoured custom which enjoined on them to elect to the throne only the senior-most man among the relatives. The Portuguese were treated with consideration and respect by the usurpers. They helped them much in their wars, and in all times of necessity assisted them with money, and assigned to them a tenth portion of the profit gained from trade. As a result of this the importance of the Portuguese increased.

A year after the arrival of about twenty ships mentioned above, another party reached Hind in a fleet of ten vessels. Of these, seven were new ships, while the remaining three belonged to the fleet of twenty ships which arrived the year before. As their passage was retarded on the way, they arrived along with the seven ships. These seven ships, loaded with merchandise, set out on their homeward voyage, and the three ships continued to remain at Kashī. The Sāmūrī, who was intent on seizing these three ships, collected about one hundred thousand Nāyars besides a large num-

3. This took place in 1503; perhaps this was the second invasion in the same year.



ber of Muslims. He could not enter Kashī because the Portuguese fought with arrows and cannon. But the Muslims from Fannān equipped themselves with three boats and fought against the Portuguese. In this engagement some Muslims became martyrs. On the following day the people of Fannān and Balinkūt got ready four boats, and the people of Fandarīna and Kābkāt three boats, and these fought a severe battle. There was no casualty on the side of the Muslims on this occasion. The battle was indecisive, because of the setting in of the rainy season. Therefore the Sāmūrī and his followers returned safely to their towns. May Allāh be praised !

In this manner a large number of ships came every year from Purtukāl filled with men and treasure, and they were sent back from Malībār to their native land, loaded with pepper, ginger, and other goods. After the Portuguese settled in Kashī and Kannanūr and secured a firm footing there, the inhabitants of these towns with their dependents engaged themselves in sea-voyages taking with them passes from the Portuguese, with a view to ensure against risks. Each ship, however small it might be, was provided with a pass, for which the Portuguese fixed a certain fee. At the time of the voyage the master of the ship took the pass on payment of the fee. The Portuguese impressed upon the inhabitants that the system of pass, introduced by them, was to their advantage and thus induced them to submit to it. Whenever the Portuguese fell in with a ship which did not possess their pass, they seized it, its crew and its cargo. On account of this high-handedness, the Sāmūrī, his subjects, and dependents were constantly fighting against the Portuguese.

The Sāmūrī spent so much in this war that in the course of time, he and his subjects grew weak. So he dispatched letters to Muslim sultāns seeking their help. They did not come forward to help him. But the sultān of Jazrāt, Sultān Maḥmūd Shāh,<sup>4</sup> the

4. Maḥmūd Shāh I was the Sultān of Gujarāt between 1458 and 1511 A.D. He is generally known as Maḥmūd Begada because of his trimmed moustache which looked like the upturned horns of a bullock,

father of the excellent Sulṭān Muẓaffar Shāh, and 'Adil Shāh<sup>5</sup> the grandfather of the great 'Alī 'Adil Shāh, issued orders to get ready vessels and corvettes which were later on found to be unsuitable to be put to sea. The sulṭān of Miṣr, Qānṣū-al-Ḡhawrī,<sup>6</sup> had sent Ḥusayn, one of his *amīrs*, with thirteen corvettes and some troops. He reached the port of Dēw in Jazrāt, and then sailed to Shiyūl in the company of Malik Iyās, the *nā'ib* at Dēw, and his corvette. They came across some ships of the Portuguese and in the fight that ensued Amīr Ḥusayn captured the larger corvettes that belonged to the Portuguese. After achieving the victory, he returned with his vessels to Dēw where he stayed during the rainy months. Nearly forty small corvettes, brought together from the cities of the Sāmūrī and elsewhere arrived at Dēw as reinforcement to Amīr Ḥusayn.

When the Portuguese heard of the Amīr's stay at Dēw, they made preparations for war, set sail in a fleet of twenty ships, and appeared suddenly before Dēw. On hearing the news of their arrival, Amīr Ḥusayn, without preparations, put to sea his corvettes and those of Malik Iyās, together with the small corvettes that came from Malībār. When the Portuguese met the combined forces they fixed their attention upon the corvettes of Amīr Ḥusayn, and captured some of them, while the remainder got separated. Thus by the decree of Allāh and His indisputable command the accursed Portuguese returned victorious to Kashī. But Amīr Ḥusayn and some of his companions got off safely with the corvettes of Malik Iyās and those of the people of Malībār. Then Amīr Ḥusayn returned to Miṣr. The Ḡhawrī, king of Miṣr, was indignant at the defeat and so he dispatched twenty-two big corvettes equipped fully with all requisites, under the command of Amīr Salmān of Rūm along with Amīr Ḥusayn. Both of them sailed with their

5. 'Adil Shāh (Ismā'il 'Adil Shāh) was the son of Yūsuf 'Adil Shāh the founder of the Sultanate of Bijāpūr. He was the Sulṭān between 1510 and 1534 A.D.

6. Qānṣū-al-Ḡhawrī was the last of the Mamlūk rulers of Egypt. He ruled from 1501 to 1516 A.D. As he was an unpopular ruler he was killed by Sulṭān Salīm Shāh of Rūm (Constantinople) in a battle in 1516 A.D. With his death the Mamlūk or Slave Dynasty of Egypt came to an end.

corvettes and reached the well protected port of Jidda whence they proceeded to the port of Kamrān. Amīr Ḥusayn engaged himself in fighting against the Yemenites and plundering their towns. Amīr Salmān, who proceeded to 'Adan, returned to Jidda. Differences arose between him and Amīr Ḥusayn. Amīr Salmān left Jidda plundering their cities. Amīr Ḥusayn was seized by the Sulṭān of the exalted Ḥijāz and thrown into the sea. After this event, information reached Jidda on the hostilities between the Ḡhawrī and Sulṭān Salīm Shāh of Rūm,<sup>7</sup> the defeat and death of the Ḡhawrī, and the capture of his kingdom by Sulṭān Salīm Shāh. Allāh is the Master over His affairs.

### 1510 A.D.

On Thursday, the 22nd of Ramazān, 915 A.H., the Portuguese attacked Kālikūt and burnt the cathedral mosque built by Nākhudā Mithqāl.<sup>8</sup> Then they entered the palace of the Sāmūrī designing to seize it, for at that time he was absent, being engaged in war in some distant place. But those of the Nāyars present at that time came upon them unexpectedly, fought against them, and drove them from the place. Nearly five hundred of the Portuguese were killed by the Nāyars while many were drowned. Those who escaped, boarded their ships, frustrated in their hopes by order of Allāh, exalted be He.

Sometime before or after this event the Portuguese invaded Fannān, and burnt about fifty ships that lay near the shores, and made nearly seventy Muslims suffer martyrdom.

In the same manner they fell upon 'Adan, and fought with its inhabitants. Allāh granted victory for the Muslims and abandoned the Portuguese. They were put to rout by order of Allāh and dis-

7. Sulṭān Salīm Shāh was the Sulṭān of Turkey, who put an end to the Mamlūk dynasty by killing Qānṣū-al-Ḡhawrī in 1516 A.D. and ruled over Egypt till 1519. After his death he was succeeded by Sulaymān the Magnificent (1520-1566). (See Sir William Muir, *The Mameluke or Slave Dynasty of Egypt* pp. 196-214).

8. Nākhudā literally means the master or commandant of a ship. He was perhaps a prosperous merchant who built the mosque referred to.

appointed in their hopes. This happened at the time of Amīr Mar-jān. After establishing themselves firmly in Kashī, and Kannanūr, the Portuguese made peace with the ruler at Kūlam and erected there a fort, because pepper was brought in large quantities to that town and Kashī than to other places.

Then they fought against the people of Kūwa,<sup>9</sup> captured it by force and occupied it. This port was one of those that belonged to 'Ādil Shāh, the grandfather of 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh the Great. They made it the capital town of their possessions in Hind and strengthened the fortifications. But 'Ādil Shāh fought against the Portuguese, took possession of Kūwa and expelled them from that city and made it the centre of Muslim influence. The Portuguese were seized with great indignation at this defeat, made great preparations and attacked the city. They recaptured it and established their authority over it. It is said that the *amīrs* and the principal men in Kūwa co-operated with the Portuguese and hence it was easy for them to recapture that city."<sup>9a</sup> Then the Portuguese constructed a number of strong fortresses. Thus they grew strong. If Allāh wills anything, He brings it to pass. The strength of the Portuguese increased day by day.

9. Goa belonged to Vijayanagar. A few years before 1507 A.D. it was captured by Yūsuf 'Ādil Shāh of Bijāpūr. The king of Vijayanagar appointed one Timoja as the commandant of the Vijayanagar fleet on the west coast in order to wage war and recapture Goa. After the death of Yūsuf 'Ādil Shāh in 1510 A.D., Alfonso de Albuquerque, the then Viceroy of the Portuguese possessions in the East, was persuaded by Timoja to attack Goa, taking advantage of the young age of Ismā'il 'Ādil Shāh of Bijāpūr who had just then succeeded his father. The Portuguese took possession of Goa in March 1510. Ismā'il 'Ādil Shāh took it back two months later. But in November of the same year the Portuguese recaptured it and made it their capital, for, being centrally situated on the west coast, it enjoyed a commanding position for commercial purposes. (Rev. H. Heras, *Aravidu Dynasty*, Vol. I, p. 57; M. S. Commissariat, *History of Gujarat*, p. 252).

9a. From the available facts of history we do not know if the Amīrs helped the Portuguese.

## SECTION 2

*Certain shameful deeds of the Portuguese*

The Muslims of Malibār lived a happy and prosperous life on account of the benevolence of their rulers, their regard to the time-honoured customs, and their kindness. But the Muslims undervalued the blessings of Allāh, and transgressed and disobeyed. So Allāh set on them the people of Purtukāl, who were Christians. They oppressed the Muslims, corrupted them and committed all kinds of ugly and infamous deeds, too bad to be described.<sup>10</sup> The Portuguese scoffed at the Muslims, and held them up to scorn. They ordered them about insolently, employed them to draw water, bespattered them and spat upon their face and body. They prevented the Muslims from their journeys, especially their pilgrimage to Makka. They plundered their properties, burnt their cities and mosques, seized their ships and trod down the Qurān and other books under their feet and burnt them away. They violated the penetralia in mosques, instigated the Muslims by bribery to accept Christianity and prostrate before the Cross. They adorned their own women with ornaments and fine clothes in order to allure the Muslim women. They put to death *hājīs* and other Muslims with all kinds of cruelties and reviled publicly the Apostle of Allāh. They held the Muslims captives binding them with heavy fetters and rushed them into the market to sell them as slaves, tormenting them, at that time, with all kinds of punishment in order to get more profits. The Portuguese kept the Muslims in a dark, dirty and stinking house. They beat the Muslims with shoes when they purified themselves with water after excretion. They tortured the Muslims with fire, sold some, and kept some as slaves and

10. The attitude of the Portuguese to the Muslims was one of inveterate hostility on account of rivalry in trade. Since the days of John III of Portugal (1521-57 A.D.) proselytism became one of the objects of the Portuguese policy in India. They also committed many excesses. In 1560 they established the inquisition at Goa. They did not scruple to destroy mosques for the construction of churches. (See *Tuhfat-al-Mujāhidīn* translated into English by Lieut. M. J. Rowlandson, pp. 103-05 *fn.*).

employed some of them for all kinds of hard labour without any compassion.

The Portuguese, after great preparations sailed to the ports of Jazrât, Konkan, Malibâr, and the coast of Arabia, lay in wait for the ships of the Muslims and seized them. Thereby they amassed abundant wealth and acquired a large number of Muslim prisoners.

How many a Muslim woman of noble birth they took as captives, and violated their honour to bring into world Christian children who would be enemies of the Faith of Allāh and agents to cause affliction to the Muslims! How many *sayyids*, learned men and nobles, they captured and tortured and put to death! How many Muslim men and women they converted to Christianity! How many such shameful and abominable deeds they committed! The tongues get weary of describing them, and hate to put them into words. May Allāh chastise them very severely!

The ardent desire of the Portuguese and their great ambition at all times were to make the Muslims renounce the faith of Islām and accept Christianity. May Allāh protect us from taking such a course! But the Portuguese had to maintain peaceful relations towards the Muslims, out of necessity, for they had to live among the Muslims who formed the main body of population in all the seaports of Malibâr. As the Muslims were the most important community in all ports, the freshly-come Portuguese men during certain seasons in the year, who noticed in Kashî the Muslims and their deportment, said to their countrymen: "The Muslims have not yet changed their characteristic traits." So they blamed their elders for not attempting to make the Muslims change their religion.

"Their intention is to extinguish Allāh's light by blowing with their mouths. But Allāh will complete the revelation of His light even though the unbelievers may detest it."<sup>11</sup>

It was for the same reason their elders said to the ruler of Kashī: "Expel the Muslims from Kashī. The benefits that accrue to you from them are small, but from us you would receive greater benefits." The ruler replied: "The Muslims are our subjects from the earliest times, and it was through them that our towns prospered. We cannot expel them."

The Portuguese were hostile only to the Muslims and their Faith and not to Nāyars and other unbelievers of Malibār.

### SECTION 3

*A treaty of peace between the Sāmūrī and the Portuguese; the erection of a fort at Kālīkūt by the Portuguese.*

As the war between the Portuguese and the Muslims prolonged for many years, the weakness of the Muslims increased. Further the Sāmūrī, who had spent big sums in these wars, died. He was succeeded by his brother. The new Sāmūrī thought that peace with the Portuguese was the best course, for, it would enable his Muslim subjects to realise profits in trade as the people of Kashī and Kannanūr, and rescue them from bad state and poverty. So a treaty of peace was concluded between the Sāmūrī and the Portuguese. The terms were :

The Portuguese were to erect a fort at Kālīkūt, and allow the subjects of the Sāmūrī to go on a voyage every year in four ships to the ports of Jidda and 'Adan.

Then the accursed Portuguese began to build a solid fort, while the subjects of the Sāmūrī made preparations for their voyage in four ships loaded with pepper and ginger to the coast of Arabia. They started on their expedition to Jazrāt and other places, carrying with them passes from the Portuguese as others did.

This was in the year 920 A.H. or 921 A.H. (1514-15 A.D.)

When four ships returned to Kālīkūt from their voyage to Arabia, the Portuguese, who had at that time completed the building of the fort, forbade them to go on their voyage again to the

Arabian coast taking pepper and ginger in their ships. Thus the Portuguese monopolized the trade in pepper and ginger. Whenever they saw even a small quantity of these two spices in any ship that did not belong to them, they seized the ship, its contents and its crew. The Portuguese were the source of great affliction and distress to the Muslims and other subjects.

The Sāmūrī, who paid due regard to the peace, endured their wrong action with patience, because he was apprehensive of their wickedness. Nevertheless, he secretly sent letters to the Muslim sovereigns urging them to make preparations for war with the Portuguese. But the Sāmūrī did not find any Muslim king willing to engage himself in hostilities with the enemy, because it shall be as Allāh, exalted be He, wills.

The Portuguese were cunning and deceitful. They knew what advantages there were for their business. In hard times they made themselves very humble before their enemies. After they achieved their object they treated them abominably. They were united in sentiment and conduct, and never disobeyed the orders of their elders, in spite of the fact that they were far away from their rulers. It was rarely that disagreement in opinion happened among them. It was never known that any one of them ever killed his elder for the purpose of assuming power. These were the reasons why the rulers of Malibār and others submitted to the Portuguese in spite of their being a small party. On the other hand the Muslim soldiers and their *amīrs* quarrelled among themselves, and were striving to depose one another from power even by killing off.<sup>12</sup>

When the accursed Portuguese established themselves firmly in Kālīkūt and acquired a steady position, they invited the Sāmūrī to their residence within the fort on the pretext of giving him the presents which were said to have been received by them from their ruler in Purtukāl. But their real design was to take him a prisoner.

12. This is a reference to the frequent quarrels between the Sultāns of Bijāpūr, Ahmadnagar, Golkonda, Birar and Bidar, not to speak of their wars with the kings of Vijayanagar.



The Sāmūrī, after going there, understood that they had designs upon him from the gesticulation of a Portuguese man, and immediately left them on the pretext that he had to ease nature. Thus he escaped with the help of Allāh, and the Portuguese could not get him into snare.<sup>13</sup> They became hostile to that particular Portuguese man and transported him and his family to Kanna-nūr.

#### 1517 A.D.

In the month of Muḥarram, 923 A.H., the Portuguese made great preparations for war and started from Kūwa with a fleet of twenty-eight ships having designs upon the well-fortified port of Jidda. When they reached that port, the Muslims were much perplexed and greatly excited with fear. Luckily for the Muslims Amīr Salmān of Rūm was there at that time with two hundred soldiers and a number of corvettes, which had been dispatched by the Sultān Ghawrī to Malibār to fight against the Portuguese. The inhabitants opened fire from land against the Portuguese and some of their ships were destroyed. Then the Portuguese hoisted all sail, steered without the range of the cannon fire, and ran away. Amīr Salmān dispatched two vessels containing thirty men in pursuit of the run-away Portuguese. They captured at Kamrān one small corvette with twelve Christians and then returned with them to Jidda. After this the accursed Portuguese remained at Kamrān till the cessation of *mawsim al-Hind* and then returned to Kūwa, frustrated in their hopes. Such was the pleasure of Allāh.

#### SECTION 4

*The hostilities between the Sāmūrī and the Portuguese and the capture of the fort at Kālīkūt.*

#### 1524 A.D.

Know then : the transgression and oppression of the Portuguese at Kālīkūt increased day by day and the Sāmūrī also was enduring

13. This incident is referred to only in this work.

that with patience. Matters were in the same state when the Portuguese engaged themselves in hostilities with the Muslims of Fandarīna who lived at Kālikūt, on the 10th of Muḥarram, 931 A.H. Thus peace was broken, and hostile operations began.

Some of the inhabitants of Fandarīna, Janbā, Tiruwarankād, Barbūrankād, and other places secretly sailed in small corvettes and captured about ten small trade vessels of the Portuguese. This event took place about 930 A.H. (1523 A.D.)

Further hostilities broke out in Kodungallūr between the Muslims and the Jews. The Jews killed a Muslim, and civil war broke out. The Muslims sent messengers to their brethren in various towns of Malibār and sought their aid to retaliate upon the Jews. The inhabitants of Kālikūt with their relatives from Fandarīna, the people of Kābkāt and Tirkūd with their relatives from Shāliyāt, men from Barbūrankād, Tiruwarankād, Tānūr, Barwanūr, Fannān, and Balīnkūt which is in the district of Shāliyāt, joined together, and decided to attack the Jews at Kodungallūr. They also resolved to wage war against the Portuguese and not to make peace with them except with the permission of the Sāmuri. This happened in 931 A.H. (1524 A.D.)

The inhabitants of the towns mentioned above embarked in a fleet of about one hundred small corvettes and sailed to Kodungallūr where they killed many Jews. Those who escaped, ran away to a village near Kodungallūr that lay to the eastward of it. The Muslims burnt their houses and synagogues. Then they set fire to the houses and the churches of the Christians. They also put to death some Nāyars when they clashed with the Muslims. As a result of this there was no safety for the Muslim residents of Kodungallūr, and they had to be removed to other towns.

In the same year the Muslim inhabitants of Darmfatan, Idakād, Kannanūr, Tiruwarankād, Haylī and Janbā leagued together against the Portuguese and fought against them. The Muslims in other towns did in like manner.

1524 A.D.

In the same year some of the *faqīhs* in Kashī like Aḥmad Marakār, his brother Kunj 'Alī Marakār, their uncle Muḥammad 'Alī Marakār and other dependents felt the desire to wage war against the Portuguese. They left Kashī for Kālikūt. When the Portuguese became aware that most of the Muslims and the Sāmūrī were firmly opposed to them, they made great preparations for war, set sail from Kashī and attacked Fannān early in the morning of the third Saturday of Jumāda'l-ūlā, 931 A.H. and burnt many houses, shops and some mosques. They cut down many cocoanut trees on the banks of the river. Many Muslims suffered martyrdom. Then the Portuguese set sail on the second night of their arrival, and reached Fandarīna where they captured about forty corvettes that belonged to its inhabitants as well as to others. There again many Muslims fell as martyrs.

When the war broke out at Kālikūt between the Portuguese and some of the Muslims in Fandarīna, the Sāmūrī resolved to fight against the Portuguese. As he was at a distant place from Kālikūt, engaged in war with some of his enemies, he sent his chief *wazīr* al-Yadh<sup>14</sup> by name with orders to fight against the Portuguese. The *wazīr* tried to do his utmost in his fight against the Portuguese and spent large sums of money on that account. The Muslims and the Nāyar soldiers of the Sāmūrī besieged the Portuguese. The Muslims from various towns went to Kālikūt in great numbers for the holy war in the way of Allāh. Then the Sāmūrī himself arrived there. By that time the Portuguese had exhausted their food supply, and they had no hope of getting fresh supplies from outside the fort. Therefore they decided to go out to their ships. They made an opening from within the fort in a part of the wall which was not visible to people outside and escaped, set sail in their ships and went away.

14. It appears the Zamorin had four *wazīrs*. They were Accan of Mangāt (മാങ്ങാട്ടച്ചൻ) Elayadu of Tēnañcēri (തേനഞ്ചേരി എളയതു) near Malappuram and two others. The *wazīr* mentioned in the text was probably Elayadu.

This happened on the 16th of Muḥarram, 932 A.H. (1525 A.D.)

In this war, over two thousand men, Nāyars of the Sāmūrī, 'āmils and Muslims, were slain. The fury and enmity of the Portuguese against the Sāmūrī and the Muslims increased after the loss of the fort. This state of affairs lasted for a long time.

After the Muslims leagued together to fight against the Portuguese, they made ready small corvettes for their voyages, loaded them with pepper, ginger and other commodities and set out on their expeditions to Jazrāt and other places without taking passes from the Portuguese, being prepared to fight against them. Some of these vessels returned safe, while many either fell into the hands of the Portuguese or held on land by their instrumentality.

The inhabitants of Darmfatan and their dependants made peace with the Portuguese towards the close of the season, and started on their expeditions carrying with them passes from the Portuguese in accordance with the old practice when they were at peace with them. But the subjects of the Sāmūrī and their followers continued their enmity to the Portuguese for many years till they became weak, and exhausted their resources.

### 1528 A.D.

About the year 935 A.H. one of the ships that belonged to the Portuguese dropped anchor at Tānūr in the beginning of the rainy season, and the ruler of that place gave them shelter. The Sāmūrī dispatched a messenger to the ruler of Tānūr demanding from him that he should surrender the Portuguese who were in the ship, together with its cargo. But the Sāmūrī did not succeed in his purpose.

Then peace was concluded between the Portuguese and the ruler of Tānūr, and his subjects started on their trade journeys carrying with them passes from the Portuguese. Then the ruler of Tānūr and the Portuguese made an agreement by which the Portuguese were permitted to erect a fort on the northern side of the river Fannān, under his territory, with a view to weaken the position of the Sāmūrī, harass the travellers and to lay waste

Fannān. With these ideas the Portuguese set sail from Kāshī equipping themselves with ships and corvettes loaded with stones and quicklime and anchored off Fannān. But with the help of Allāh stormy wind caused many wrecks. Some of the ships were cast away on the southern side of Balinkūt. None returned safe except one small corvette. A large number of the Portuguese, their adherents and servants were drowned. Those who succeeded in reaching the shore were slain by the Muslims. A great number of men who were prisoners in the hands of the Portuguese were set free. The Sāmūrī gained all the big cannon. Thus Allāh frustrated the hopes of the Portuguese and their allies.

#### 1530-31 A.D.

About the year 937 A.H. or 938 A.H. the subjects of the Sāmūrī and others set sail in a fleet of about thirty ships carrying merchandise to Jazrāt. 'Alī Ibrāhīm Marakār, his nephew Kuttī Ibrāhīm Marakār and other distinguished persons were among them. Many of these vessels entered the ports of Jūjārī and Sūrat, while some of them sailed to Barūj. The Portuguese went in pursuit of them in their own vessels and corvettes, entered the rivers at Jūjārī and Sūrat and captured the corvettes that were there along with the contents. Those that were lying at Barūj escaped.

Before this event took place, the Portuguese seized many of the corvettes that were employed by Sultān Bahādūr Shāh of Jazrāt to fight against the Portuguese. In the same manner the Portuguese captured on different occasions many corvettes that belonged to the people of Malibār, and the Muslims were reduced to weakness and despair.

The decree of Allāh is indisputable. *Verily we are for Allāh and to Allāh we return.*<sup>15</sup>

15. This verse from the holy Qurān is quoted when any unfortunate incident, particularly death takes place.

## SECTION 5

*The erection of a fort at Shāliyāt by the Portuguese ; the conclusion of peace between them and the Sāmūrī for the second time.*

One of the highest officials<sup>16</sup> of the Portuguese started from Kashī by land, and presented himself before the Sāmūrī in the name of peace concealing treachery and deceit. He was very intelligent, cunning and deceitful in the fullest sense. He had friendship with some of the leading Muslim merchants and did business with them during the time of peace. He reached Fannān, and from there he went to the ruler of Tānūr and stayed with him till he brought about peace between him and the Sāmūrī.

The Sāmūrī who captured the fort at Kālikūt was a weak monarch, not very wise. He was permanently addicted to the habits of drinking. After his death Nambiyāḍhar, his brother, succeeded him. The new monarch was strong, brave, zealous and not punctilious in the observance of ancient customs prevalent among them. The weakness of that Sāmūrī (Nambiyāḍhar's brother) brought about great suffering to the ruler of Tānūr, the Sāmūrī himself and their adherents, and the successors of that Sāmūrī, because the Portuguese had built a fort at Shāliyāt which was the high way through which the Sāmūrī, his troops and all the travellers used to go. Moreover the trade from Kālikūt to the coast of Arabia through Shāliyāt, which was situated at a distance of about two parasangs from Kālikūt, also suffered. The Sāmūrī who was weak and addicted to the habits of inebriety, permitted the Portuguese to build a fort at Shāliyāt, after he won over to his side its ruler. Then the Portuguese went to Shāliyāt, in a big ship laden with necessary materials and instruments for the building of a fort. They entered the river of Shāliyāt towards the end of the month of Rabī'ul'-ākhir, 938 A.H. (1531 \* A.D.), and erected a strong fort. They demolished the ancient cathedral mosque which was built there

16. The name of this high official is not known.

on the first introduction of Islām in Malibār—of which mention was already made along with other mosques—and made use of its materials for the building of the fort and the church.

In the course of the construction of the fort, one of the Portuguese carried away a stone from the cathedral mosque mentioned above, and the Muslim inhabitants of Shāliyāt complained of it to the chief Portuguese officer at that place. Immediately the officer went in person with his followers and gave orders that the breach should be repaired with stone and quick lime. This satisfied the Muslims who went away with good feeling.

Next day the Portuguese returned in great numbers, pulled down the entire building of the cathedral mosque and did not leave there a single stone. Again the Muslims complained to the Portuguese officer. He replied: "The ruler of your town had sold to us the mosque and the ground on which it was built." When the Muslims heard this reply they returned sorrowfully. Since that time they used to assemble for prayer in a small mosque situated at a great distance from their dwelling houses.

Then the accursed Portuguese dug out tombs from the Muslim cemetery and with the stones collected from there, they completed the building of their fort.

Before the fort was completed the Sāmūrī who was a weak ruler, died.

The new Sāmūrī (Nambiyādhar) was not a peacemaker. He fought with the ruler of Shāliyāt and laid waste his territory. In due course he submitted to the Sāmūrī, and made peace with him, agreeing to the terms dictated by the victorious ruler.

In that year Amīr Muṣṭafā of Rūm<sup>17</sup> arrived from Makhā

17. Amīr Muṣṭafā, son of Bahrām of Constantinople was the nephew of Salmān Ra'īs, a Turk admiral and adventurer who entered the service of Salīm Shāh of Rūm and eventually became the lord of Yemen. On the death of his uncle in 1529 A.D. Amīr Muṣṭafā became the master of the Abyssinian slaves. His father Bahrām gave orders that he should help Bahādūr Shāh of Gujarāt against the Portuguese. Amīr Muṣṭafā arrived at Diu in 1531 A.D. and was received by Malik Tūghan, son of Malik Iyās,

to Dēw in Jazrāt, with cannon and vast treasure. Malik Tūghan, son of Malik Iyās, was the governor of Dēw, representing Sultān Bahādur Shāh. After his arrival, the Portuguese went there with the idea of subjugating that port. Amīr Muṣṭafā of Rūm fought against them and cannonaded them with great vigour. The Portuguese were routed with the help of Allāh. They ran away in fear, disgrace and disappointment.

## SECTION 6

### *Conclusion of peace between the Sāmūrī and the Portuguese for the third time*

#### 1533 A.D.

The Portuguese made peace with the Sāmūrī for the third time in 940 A.H., agreeing to certain conditions. One of these was that the Portuguese should permit four ships to sail from Kālikūt to the Arabian coast. Accordingly four ships set sail, during that season, to the coast of Arabia. The subjects of the Sāmūrī also started on their trade journeys to different cities carrying with them passes from the Portuguese.

Then the Sāmūrī attacked the ruler of Tānūr, and weakened him to such an extent that he was compelled to make peace with the Sāmūrī by surrendering to him his lands contiguous to Fannān, and the island in the neighbourhood of Shāliyāt.

the governor of the place. Amīr Muṣṭafā fought against the Portuguese and defeated them in a naval engagement off Diu in 1531 A.D. Bahādur Shāh, the sultān of Gujārāt conferred upon Amīr Muṣṭafā the title of *Rumī Khān* in recognition of his services and gave him as his fiefs Rander, Surat and all the adjoining coast as far as Mahim. Later Bahādur Shāh made him the Governor of Diu dismissing Malik Tūghan from that office. But Amīr Muṣṭafā deserted Bahādur Shāh in 1535 and took service under the Mughal emperor Humāyūn when he invaded Gujārāt. Amīr Muṣṭafā died at Chunar in 1538. (See M. S. Commissariat, *History of Gujarat*, pp. 338-39).



The chief officer of the Portuguese who went from Kashī for the purpose of erecting a fort at Shāliyāt, mediated between the ruler of Tānūr and the Sāmuri and brought about the peace.

Khwāja Husayn Sanjuqdār of Rūm, and Kunj 'Alī Marakār, brother of Aḥmad Marakār the *faqīh*, travelled by corvettes and arrived in Kālīkūt with large presents to the Sāmuri from Sulṭān Bahādur Shāh. They also brought with them vast amounts of money with a view to induce the Muslims of Malibār, through the influence of the Sāmuri, to go to Jazrāt in order that they might take part in the naval war with the Portuguese. But the Marakārs did not achieve their purpose.

They arrived at Kālīkūt on the 16th of Rabī'u'l-awwal, 941 A.H. (1534 A.D.).

#### SECTION 7

*Conclusion of peace between Sulṭān Bahādur Shāh and the Portuguese; the Sulṭān hands over to the Portuguese certain ports.*

#### 1535 A.D.

Towards the end of the year 941 A.H. Sulṭān Humāyūn Bādshāh<sup>18</sup> son of Babar Bādshāh,<sup>19</sup> after he consolidated his power in Delhi, turned his attention to Jazrāt. He devastated some of the towns in Jazrāt. Bahādur Shāh was put to rout. He was filled with terror and so he sent messengers to the Portuguese, seeking their aid. In response to the message, they met Sulṭān Bahādur Shāh and an alliance was concluded between them, the Sulṭān granting to the Portuguese some of the ports that belonged to him, like Wassā and Mahāim

18. Humāyūn Bādshāh was the Mughal Emperor between 1530 and 1540 and 1555 and 1556 A.D. During the years 1540 and 1555 A.D. he was a wanderer, as he was deprived of his empire by Shēr Shāh.

19. Babar Bādshāh (Zahīru'd-Dīn Muḥammad) was the founder of the Mughal empire in India. He ruled at Delhi between 1526 and 1530.

and others. The Portuguese took possession of these ports and added to them the towns and lands in their neighbourhood. They derived from these possessions great advantages, and their power increased. Sultān Bahādur Shāh handed over to them the port of Dēw and permitted them to strengthen it. He also assigned to them half of the tax 'ushūr. They were also permitted by the sultān to rule over the place, and to strengthen its fortifications.

It may be recalled here that in olden times the Portuguese were longing to get possession of the island Dēw. They attempted several times to capture it during the reign of Malik Iyās and his sons. But they were never able to subdue it and they always returned disappointed in their hopes.

When their aspiration accorded with the will of Allāh, exalted be He, it became easy for them to get possession of it.

Allāh, glory be to Him, and exalted be He, had also decreed that Sultān Bahādur Shāh should die by the hands of the Portuguese. They killed him and threw his body into the sea.<sup>20</sup> *Verily we are for Allāh and to Allāh we return.* The command of Allāh is predetermined. Sultān Bahādur Shāh was slain on the 3rd of Ramazān 943 A.H. (1537 A.D.). After the martyrdom of the Sultān, the Portuguese took possession of the whole of Dēw and settled there.

Such was the decree of Allāh, the All-Wise and the All-Powerful. No one shall repel the judgment of Allāh, or dispute His will.

20. Bahādur Shāh ceded the island of Diu in 1535 to the Portuguese for their help against Humāyūn Bādshāh, and permitted them to erect a fort in that island. But subsequently he regretted his act and wanted to drive the Portuguese out of Diu. The Portuguese viceroy Nuno da Cunha was also aware of the Sultān's ideas. In 1537 while Bahādur Shāh was returning after a visit to the viceroy at Diu, he met his tragic end. The evidences regarding his sudden death are conflicting. According to some he was drowned; some say he was killed. But it appears the Portuguese were responsible for his death. (M. S. Commissariat, *History of Gujarat*, pp. 374-383).

**1537-38 A.D.**

In the year 944 A.H. the Portuguese fell upon Barūnūr and killed Kutti Ibrāhīm Marakār, the nephew of 'Alī Ibrāhīm Marakār, and many others. They set fire to the town and then returned, notwithstanding the fact that they were at peace with the ruler of Tānūr and his subjects. Moreover, the inhabitants of Tānūr and Barūnūr used to go on their voyages with permits from the Portuguese. The reason for this act of violence on the part of the Portuguese appears to be that the people of Barūnūr sent a ship laden with pepper and ginger to the port of Jidda without taking a pass from them, and the one thing which the Portuguese detested most was the journey undertaken by others for purposes of trade in pepper and ginger to any place, and especially to the port of Jidda.

Then the Sāmūrī set out for Kodungallūr to fight against the Portuguese and the ruler of Kashī. The fight continued for many days. Allāh infused into the Sāmūrī's mind a dread of these people, and consequently he returned from Kodungallūr without achieving any thing. The Portuguese built a fort at Kodungallūr.<sup>21</sup> It was a mighty barrier preventing access to the Sāmūrī.

'Alī Ibrāhīm Marakār and Aḥmad Marakār the *faqīh* and his brother Kunj 'Alī Marakār started in the direction of Qāil in a fleet of forty-two corvettes. When they arrived off Baytāla, they landed, securing their vessels with anchor. As they halted at Baytāla for a long time, they were perverted. The Portuguese went there in their corvettes, fought against them, and by the order of Allāh, they captured all the corvettes of the Muslims. In this encounter many Muslims fell as martyrs. This event took place towards the end of *Shā'bān*, 944 A.H. (1538 A.D.). The Muslims who escaped, left Baytāla for Malībār. When they arrived at Nallānballī, on their way, 'Alī Ibrāhīm Marakār died.

21. The fort was constructed in 1537 A.D.

About the middle of the month of Shawwāl, 944 A.H., (1538 A.D.) the Portuguese captured some corvettes that belonged to the inhabitants of Kābkāt, situated opposite to Kannanūr.

## SECTION 8

*The arrival of the Sulaymān Bāshā in the region of Dēw*

**1537-38 A.D.**

In the year 944 A.H. Sulaymān Bāshā,<sup>22</sup> the *wazīr* of Sultān Sulaymān Shāh about whom mention was already made, reached the port of 'Adan with about one hundred well-equipped corvettes, *barshas* and other kinds of vessels. He attacked the port, and killed its sultān by name Shaykh 'Āmir ibn Dā'ūd and some of his principal men and took possession of the town.

Then he marched against Jazrāt and fell upon Dēw. He destroyed the major portion of the fort walls with big cannon he brought with him. In the course of the fight, Allāh infused into the mind of Sulaymān Bāshā fear of the Portuguese and he returned without success first to Miṣr and then to Rūm. Allāh had predetermined these events, subjecting His servants to test. The Portuguese repaired the fort at Dēw, and strengthened it ten-fold.

A year after 'Alī Ibrāhīm Marakār's death, Aḥmad Marakār the *faqīh*, and his brother Kunj 'Alī Marakār sailed in a fleet of eleven corvettes towards Silān. But the Portuguese followed

22. Sulaymān Bāshā was one of the generals of Sultān Salīm of Rūm. He accompanied Sultān Salīm in his expedition for the conquest of Egypt in 1516 A.D. In 1525 A.D. he was made the governor of that province by Sultān Sulaymān the Magnificent. In 1535 he was sent to Yemen and Aden to put down a rebellion. On his return in 1537 he was again made governor of Egypt. On the death of Bahādur Shāh of Gujarat in 1537, Sultān Sulaymān the Magnificent ordered Sulaymān Bāshā to proceed to Dīu with a large fleet to put an end to the power of the Portuguese in

them, attacked and captured the corvettes in their possession. Many Muslims suffered martyrdom. The two Marakārs and those who escaped made their way to the ruler of Silān who treacherously put them to death. "*Verily we are for Allāh, and to Allāh we return.*"

## SECTION 9

### *Conclusion of peace between the Sāmūrī and the Portuguese for the fourth time*

As the Portuguese sought of the Sāmūrī peace, he agreed to it. He was then at Fannān. The rulers of Tānūr and Kodungallūr took part in the negotiations for peace and they tried their utmost to establish peace which was concluded in Shah'bān, 946 A.H. (1540 A.D.). The subjects of the Sāmūrī commenced their trade journeys carrying with them passes from the Portuguese.

On the 8th of Muḥarram, 952 A.H., (1545 A.D.), the Portuguese put to death Abū Bakr 'Alī and Kunj Ṣūfī.

Abū Bakr 'Alī was a Muslim leader of great eminence, resident at Kannanūr. He was the uncle of 'Alī Ādhrāja.<sup>23</sup> Kunj Ṣūfī was the father of 'Alī Ādhrāja.

India. Sulaymān Bāshā started for India in June 1537 and on his way sacked Aden early in August and hanged the Arab ruler of the place Shaykh 'Amīr ibn Dā'ūd along with other leading nobles. (See M. S. Commissariat, *History of Gujarat*, pp. 400-402).

23. He appears to have been the Chief of Cannanore about 1545 A.D. The history of the family of 'Alī Ādhrāja is shrouded in mystery. According to the *Keralotpatti*, Cēramān Perumāḷ invited a Muslim family from a place called Āryapuram and installed it at Cannanore. But according to local tradition the earliest ancestor of the family of Ādhrāja was a Nāyar called Arayan Kuḷangara Nāyar, one of the ministers of Koḷattiri (Cīrakkal Rāja). This Nāyar is said to have lived about the beginning of the twelfth century A.D. It is believed he became a convert to Islām and took the name Muḥammad or Muḥammad 'Alī. He continued to be the minister of Koḷattiri. After his death his descendants ruled over Cannanore with the title 'Alī Rāja.

Hostilities broke out on account of this and continued for many days. Then peace was established.

## SECTION 10

### *Hostility between the Sāmūrī and the Portuguese*

**1550 A.D.**

The reason for this hostility was as follows :

A treaty of peace was concluded on the 1st of Muḥarram, 957 A.H. between the Sāmūrī and one of the rulers of Malibār who was the important ally of the ruler of Kashī, and whose territory was contiguous to Kashī on the southern side. The ruler was styled *Pepper-king*<sup>24</sup> by the Portuguese, because large quantities of pepper were exported from his towns. He became one of the allies of the Sāmūrī and gave him his kingdom. The Pepper-king requested the Sāmūrī that his brother might be recognised as the fourth in the line of succession to the Sāmūrī. The Sāmūrī made his brother the fourth in the succession, in accordance with the ancient custom prevalent in Malibār. When the Pepper-king returned to his town, the ruler of Kashī and the Portuguese made hostile inroad into his territory. There was a battle and the Pepper-king was burnt to death. This event took place in Jumāda'l-ūlā of that year. When the news of the death of the Pepper-king reached the Sāmūrī, he set out immediately from Kālikūt to fight against the Portuguese and their ally. He reached the town of the Pepper-king and waged war against the Portuguese and the ruler of Kashī, spending a vast amount of wealth. But he returned without gaining any advantage either for himself or for his ally.

24. Evidently the author refers to the Rāja of Vatakkenkūr (also called Pimienta) who was a friend of the Zamorin. His territory lay to the south-east of Cochin. (See K. P. Padmanabha Menon, *History of Kerala*, Vol. I, pp. 502-03).

On the 8th Jumāda'l-ākhira, a large body of the troops of the Pepper-king invaded Kashī, notwithstanding the barrier of the river between them and the town, burnt many of its dwelling-houses, and caused great damage to the inhabitants of Kashī. They resorted to this act of violence because their ruler was killed in the fight against the ruler of Kashī, and the Portuguese. May Allāh chastise them with a severe chastisement. It was in consequence of this war that there was enmity between the Sāmūrī and the Portuguese.

The Portuguese made great preparations for war, set out from Kūwa and fell upon Tirkūd, and burnt there many houses, shops, and the cathedral mosque. This event took place on the morning of Saturday, the 14th Shawwāl of the year mentioned above.

Next day the Portuguese attacked Fandarīna, and set fire to many houses, shops and the cathedral mosque, one of the earliest in Malibār. On Thursday, the 18th of Shawwāl, they attacked Fannān, and burnt many houses and four mosques including the cathedral mosque. In all these three towns a large number of Muslims suffered martyrdom.

Towards the end of Jumāda'l-ākhira, 960 A.H. (1553 A.D.) it was reported in Malibār that 'Alī of Rūm fell as martyr in the course of his fight against the Portuguese opposite to Karkar and his corvettes were captured by the enemy. May Allāh destroy the Portuguese as he destroyed the 'Ād and the Thamūd.<sup>25</sup>

25. The 'Ād people, with their prophet Hūd, are mentioned in the Qurān in many places. They occupied a large tract of country in Southern Arabia, extending from 'Umān at the mouth of the Persian Gulf to Hadhramawt and Yemen at the southern end of the Red Sea. The people were tall in stature and were great builders. They forsook God, and oppressed their people. A three years' famine visited them, but they took no warning. At length a terrible blast of wind destroyed them and their land.

The Thamūd people were the successors to the culture and civilisation of the 'Ād people. They were cousins to the 'Ād, apparently a younger branch of the same race. Their seat was in the north-west corner of Arabia (*Arabia Petraea*) between Madina and Syria. With the advance

*Verily we are for Allāh and to Allāh we return. Such is the decree of Allāh, the All-Powerful and the All-knowing.*

On a previous occasion 'Alī seized some of the vessels that belonged to the Portuguese, descended upon the Funna Qāil, a village near Qāil, where the Portuguese lived in. He fought against them, put them to rout and devastated the place.

During the month of Rajab, 960 A.H. (1553 A.D.), Yūsuf, the Turk, arrived from Dēw-mahall to Fannān, against the *mausim*, bringing with him big cannon which he seized from the Portuguese.

## SECTION 11

### *Conclusion of peace between the Sāmūrī and the Portuguese for the fifth time.*

When the Portuguese proceeded along adopting the same course of action, the power and the strength of the Muslims weakened. The Sāmūrī concluded peace with the Portuguese. His subjects went on their voyages for trade carrying with them passes as others did.

The treaty of peace was concluded between the Sāmūrī and the Portuguese in the beginning of Muḥarram, 963 A.H. (1555 A.D.).

About two years or more after this peace, hostilities began between the Portuguese and the Muslims in Kannanūr, Darmfatan and the neighbourhood of these two towns. This enmity continued to exist for nearly two years. Then the Muslims made

of material civilisation, the Thamūd people became godless and arrogant. Their prophet and warner was Šāliḥ. They did not pay any heed to his warnings. When the cup of their iniquities was full, the Thamud people were destroyed by a dreadful earthquake, which threw them prone on the ground and buried them with their houses.

See Qurān, *Sūrā VII*, verses 65-79.



peace with the Portuguese and began to undertake journeys by sea taking with them passes as they used to do before.

During the period of the holy war against the Portuguese, a great leader 'Alī Ādhrāja by name, who was energetic and zealous, spent a large amount of money in that war. But the ruler of Kōlattirī and his subjects in other towns did not lend support to Ādhrāja. It was during that period the accursed Portuguese started out in angry mood to despoil Ādhrāja of his islands in Malībār.<sup>26</sup> The Portuguese went in their corvettes and attacked the island of Amīnī where they killed a large number of inhabitants, captured more than four hundred men and women, plundered almost everything of value, and burnt many houses and mosques. Before they descended upon Amīnī, they went to Shaytlākam where they slew some of the people and captured some. The inhabitants in all these islands were ignorant of the use of weapons, and there was none competent to fight. Notwithstanding this, a large number of the people fought against the enemy and fell as martyrs. Of these the qāẓī of the place, and a pious woman were worthy of note. The qāẓī was an elderly person, virtuous and pious. Though the inhabitants of that island possessed no arms, they were prepared to give testimony of their faith in their religion and die as martyrs. They flung earth, and stones at the Portuguese, and inflicted blows on them severely with sticks till they were killed.

The islands of Malībār are many in number, but the biggest of these has within its limits only five islands; Amīnī, Kārdīb, Andūr, Kalfinī, and Malkī. Of the small islands the thickly populated ones are Aktī, Kanjmanjalā, Kaltan, Shaytlākam.

When Allāh, glory be to Him, exalted be He, wished to put His servants to the test, He granted respite to the Portuguese. He enabled them to establish their power in a large number of ports like the seaports of Malībār, Jazrāt, Konkan, and other places. They

26. This is a reference to the group of islands known as the Laccadives. One of the islands in the group was Amīnī, which even now goes by the same name.

had their sway over these places by opening trade factories in most of these towns. They built fortresses in Hurmūz, Masqat, Dēw-maḥall, Shamṭara, Malāqa, Malūkū, Maylapūr, Nākfatan and in other seaports of Shōlamandal, and also in many ports of Silān. Further they had reached as far as Sin. Their trade was flourishing in these ports, and elsewhere, while the Muslim merchants in these places were humbled and made to submit to the Portuguese as slaves. The Muslim merchants were not permitted to trade in all merchandise except in goods for which the Portuguese had a little interest. The commodities in which the Portuguese had interest yielded large profits. They assumed the right of exclusive possession of the trade in such commodities, and it was not possible for others to encroach on their rights. Their monopoly started at pepper and ginger but gradually they added in the list cinnamon, clove, spice and such other articles which yielded large profits. The Muslims were forbidden to do business in all these articles and to undertake sea-voyages for trade purposes to the Arabian coast, Malāqa, Āshī, Danāsrī, and other places. Thus there remained nothing for the Muslims of Malibār, but the petty trade in arecanut, cocoanut, clothes and such other things. Their sea-traffic also was confined to Jazrāt, Konkan, Shōlamandal, and round about Qāil. As the rice was imported into Malibār, Kūwa and the ports of Arabia from Hannūr, Bāsalūr and Manjalūr, the Portuguese built their forts in these places with a view to hinder the rice from being brought to the people of Malibār. The Portuguese used to import merchandise from different parts of the earth, stored them in various parts of the districts and continued to augment it.

The rulers in different seaports submitted themselves to them to such an extent that the authority of the Portuguese in these places became supreme. The journey by sea was not possible for the Muslims except under the protection of the Portuguese and with their passes. Thus there was much trade for the Portuguese and they owned a number of ships. On the other hand there was a little traffic on sea for the Muslims, and their carrying-trade was through the ships of the Portuguese.

None ventured to capture the forts built by the Portuguese except Sultān 'Alī al-Āshī who waged a holy war against them. The Sultān captured Shamṭara and Jala'a and made them the

centre of Muslim influence. May Allāh reward him for this service to the Muslims. The Sāmūrī at Kālikūt was another ruler who dared to attack and capture two forts that belonged to the Portuguese, one at Kālikūt and the other at Shāliyāt. The ruler of Silān was the third ruler who made bold to capture all the forts built by the Portuguese in that island, but his conquests were not permanent as was the case in other places.

At the beginning, the Portuguese had regard for those who were under their protection and who took the pass from them. They never molested the owners of vessels who took passes from them except for some special reasons. But from about 960 A.H. (1553 A.D.) they delivered the passes to the masters of ships at the time of journey. If they could master the ships in the open sea, they took possession of the ships and the cargo. They killed the Muslims and others on board in the most wicked manner, butchered them, or drowned them after binding the victims with ropes, or tied a number of them together in nets and cast them into the sea.

### 1562 A.D.

In the year 970 A.H. or before it, they captured in Kūwa a large number of Muslim merchants who were Abyssinians, and compelled them to embrace Christianity. As they were tormented, many formally declared their faith in Christianity. But when they departed from them with whatever property they could carry, they reverted to Islām glorifying Allāh. But an Abyssinian woman whom the Portuguese compelled to embrace Christianity refused, and she was put to death.

## SECTION 12

*The causes for the enmity between the Sāmūrī and the Portuguese ; the Sāmūrī's corvettes set out to attack the Portuguese.*

When the Portuguese acted with a heavy hand, the strength of the Muslims decreased owing to the interruption of their maritime trade. Then parties of men from among the inhabi-

tants of Budfatan, Tirküd, Fandarîna and other places took steps to get ready small corvettes and implements of war and set out on their voyage without taking passes from the Portuguese, and fought against them. The Muslims succeeded in capturing a number of their corvettes and vessels. Then the inhabitants of Kâbkât, Bandar-al-Jadid, Kâlikût and Fannân, who were subjects of the Sâmurî, seized many of the vessels, and corvettes and took many Portuguese captives. The Muslims acquired great wealth in these enterprises. This victory is a sign of Allâh's grace in contravention to what the Muslims met with in the beginning of their war against the Portuguese. The Muslims captured a great number of ships that belonged to the unbelievers of Jazrât, Konkan, and other places. In consequence of these activities the Portuguese could not undertake many journeys by sea, except with great precaution or sailing with a fleet of corvettes and vessels.

When the Portuguese did not get enough from the unbelievers they began to plunder the property of the Muslims oppressing them and tyrannising them. The main reason for this was that the majority of men who possessed corvettes were weak and not very rich, while the joint owners of corvettes competed with them in trade. If the duty levied on goods of the unbelievers was not adequate to their requirements, the Portuguese seized whatever they could get of the goods of the Muslims to make up the deficiency notwithstanding the fact that at the time of voyage they agreed with the Muslims not to seize their goods.

When they once seized the property of the Muslims they never restored it to the owner, for there was none among the Muslims who could enforce such a procedure. On the other hand the ruler of the port assessed a tax upon the goods seized from the Muslims. Nor will it be of any avail to compel the Portuguese to be faithful to their agreement. Such enforcement will be for those who are god-fearing, and there were few sincerely religious men among them.

#### 1567 A.D.

In the middle of Ramazân, 974 A.H. the inhabitants of Fannân, Fandarîna, and others started from Fannân with a fleet of

about twelve corvettes and captured opposite to Fannān a merchant vessel of the Portuguese that sailed from Banjāla carrying rice and sugar.

On Saturday, the 8th of Jumāda'l-ākhirā, 976 A.H. (1568 A.D.) the inhabitants of Fannān and Fandarīna and others who owned corvettes started from Fannān, with a fleet of seventeen corvettes. Kutti Bōkar<sup>27</sup> was one of the parties. They captured off Shāliyāt a big *barsha* which started from Kāshī with great preparations, carrying nearly one thousand brave men, their allies and servants, besides a vast store of merchandise. In the course of the fight, fire broke out in the *barsha* and it was burnt. The Muslims secured some of the big cannon and captured more than a hundred Portuguese, brave and eminent men, besides servants and attendants. The rest perished either in the sea or in the fire. Plentiful praise be to Allāh.

Some days after this event the same party of the Muslims sailed towards Qāil, captured twenty-two ships that belonged to the Portuguese and their allies. These ships were laden with rice obtained from Qāil and in its neighbourhood, from Shōlamandal and other places. There were also on board the vessels, three small elephants. The Muslims returned with their booty to Fannān, entered the river and disembarked.

#### 1570 A.D.

In the latter part of the month of Jumāda'l-ākhirā, 978 A.H. Kutti Bōkar sailed at night with six corvettes along the river of Manjalūr, burnt many a fortress of the Portuguese along the shore, captured a small corvette and was returning safe without any loss. When he approached Kannanūr he came across fifteen corvettes that belonged to the Portuguese, and fought against them. In the course of the fight he fell a martyr and his body was lost. May Allāh's unbounded mercy be upon him. Only two of

27. *Kutti*, in Malayalam and Tamil, means *small, young*.

*Bokar* is a modification of the Arabic name *Abū Bakr*.

his corvettes got off safely. He was sincere in his devotion to fight against the Portuguese.

‘Ali Ādhrāja, a man of leading in Kannanūr, perceived that the Muslims were sinking into feebleness and degradation on account of the accursed Portuguese. He sent letters with presents to the mighty and generous Sultān ‘Ali ‘Ādil Shāh, complaining of what had befallen the Muslims of Malibār owing to the tyranny and oppression of the Portuguese and seeking of him help to wage holy war in the way of Allāh for the purpose of rescuing these Muslims who were becoming weaker on account of the cruelty of the Portuguese. Allāh infused in the Sultān’s mind the idea that he should get ready for an expedition against the port of Kūwa, the capital city of the Portuguese in Hind.

This city once belonged to the Sultān’s grandfather. A treaty of peace had been concluded between ‘Ādil Shāh and Nizām Shāh,<sup>28</sup> immediately after devastating Bijānakar and the death of its ruler. The terms of the treaty prescribed that they should subjugate Kūwa and Shiyūl.

Soon after he received the letter from Ādhrāja, Sultān ‘Ali ‘Ādil Shāh started in person with his ministers, reached Kūwa, and commenced fighting against the Portuguese. The sultān intercepted the food supply to them. ‘Ādil Shāh sent a letter to the Sāmūrī intimating that he had commenced hostilities against the Portuguese in Kūwa. He requested in that letter that the Sāmūrī should assist him in this war and cut off supplies to the Portuguese. Already the Sāmūrī and his subjects were in a state of open

28. Nizām Shāh (Murtaẓā Nizām Shāh) was the Sultān of Ahmadnagar between 1565 and 1588. During the early years of his reign the affairs of the kingdom were controlled by his mother.

In 1570 Nizām Shāh and ‘Ali ‘Ādil Shāh of Bijāpūr co-operated with the Zamorin of Calicut to drive out the Portuguese from Goa and Chaul, and divide their possessions. ‘Ali ‘Ādil Shāh besieged Goa while Murtaẓā besieged Chaul. But both of them were frustrated in their attempts. The nobles of Nizām Shāh betrayed him by not only supplying the Portuguese with intelligence but also with provisions.

hostility against the Portuguese, for many years in the past. The messenger from 'Ādil Shāh delivered the letter to the Sāmūrī at Shāliyāt where he was busy fighting against the Portuguese.

Nizām Shāh and his *wazīrs* reached Shiyūl and attacked it. They battered at its fortification with big cannon. When it was about to be subjugated Nizām Shāh relaxed his efforts because he was distrustful of 'Ādil Shāh and had an overestimation of the Portuguese. Nizām Shāh stopped fighting and concluded peace, with the enemy.

As for Sultān 'Ādil Shāh, he might be exonerated from blame for the failure in his own undertaking, for Kūwa was far away from his encampment, and also the river lay between him and the city. Further the fortress at Kūwa was strong and inaccessible with extensive fortifications and it was not possible for any one to subjugate it except with the help of the Almighty Allāh. In addition to these impediments some of the *wazīrs* of 'Ādil Shāh joined hands with the Portuguese and agreed to depose the sultān and choose in his place one of his relatives who was then at Kūwa with the Portuguese. 'Ādil Shāh, who scented treachery, was afraid of the consequences and therefore left his camp in secrecy. When he reached a place of safety he sent for his *wazīrs*, imprisoned them, chastised them and deprived them of their ranks. Then 'Ādil Shāh concluded peace with the Portuguese on account of certain important reasons. But the Portuguese, during this interval of peace, strengthened the fortifications at Kūwa and made the city strong, and inaccessible in such a manner that no one could enter it from outside. This is ordained by Allāh, the All-Powerful and the All-Wise.

It should also be observed that Nizām Shāh, his *wazīrs* as well as those of 'Ādil Shāh, were perfidious to the sultān. They took bribes from the Portuguese, the enemies of Islām, and conveyed to them provisions and assisted them. May Allāh give them recompense for their evil deeds!

## SECTION 13

*The battle at Shāliyāt and its subjugation***1571 A.D.**

The Sāmūrī stood firm with the resolution to lay siege to Shāliyāt<sup>29</sup> on account of the transgression of the Portuguese and the earnest request of the Muslims that he should fight against them, especially their entreaty that he should avail himself of the opportunity at the time of the Muslim expedition to Kūwa. However, the Muslims were not able to send ships and corvettes at the time and render assistance. The Sāmūrī appointed some of his ministers to lead the people of Fannān and a large number of the inhabitants who came from Shāliyāt for their assistance. These were joined on the way by the inhabitants of Barūnūr, Tānūr, and Barbūrānkād. All these Muslims entered Shāliyāt during the night of the 24th or 25th of Šafar, 979 A.H. The battle began in the morning between the Muslims and the Portuguese. The Muslims burnt their houses situated outside the fort, the churches, and destroyed the fortifications built of mud. On the side of the Muslims only three suffered martyrdom while a large number of the Portuguese died. The enemy took refuge in the solid fort, built of stone, and settled themselves there. The Muslims and the Nāyar soldiers of the Sāmūrī besieged them. The Muslims from various towns also came there in flocks to take part in that holy war. They dug trenches around the fort and sat round it keeping watch all the time. It is rarely that the Portuguese could get provisions in secret. The Sāmūrī spent in that war a large amount of money. Two months after the siege began, the Sāmūrī went there in person from Fannān. The besiegers watched all the time by the side of the fort, so that the besieged, who could not get fresh supplies, exhausted all provisions available in the fort and ate dogs and such loathsome animals. Every day servants, men and women, who became con-

29. The Zamorin besieged the fort of Shāliyāt in 1571. The siege lasted for four months, and at the end of the period the Portuguese were completely defeated.



verts to Christianity, came out of the fort with their permission owing to the scarcity of food. The Portuguese sent provisions from Kashī and Kannanūr for the besieged in Shāliyāt, but rarely did these reach them, in spite of their great effort to convey the supplies safe from enemies.

During the siege, the Portuguese sent messengers to the Sāmuri and sued for peace, offering to surrender some of the big cannon kept in their fort, and to indemnify amply for expenses incurred in the war. The Sāmuri did not agree to it although his ministers were satisfied with the offer. When the Portuguese were in an extremely dangerous condition for want of food, and did not find any way to conclude peace, they sent messengers offering to surrender the fort and all that it contained, and the cannon, provided that a safe passage was given for them and protection for property in their possession assured, till they reached a place where they could feel safe and secure. The Sāmuri agreed to these conditions and permitted the garrison to march out at midnight on the 16th of Jumāda'l-ākhirā, giving them a safe passage in accordance with his promise. They were sent away in a despicable condition, along with the ruler of Tānūr, who aided and abetted them. He was inwardly favourable to their cause but outwardly pretended to be a friend of the Sāmuri. The ruler of Tānūr provided them with all necessities and conducted them to Tānūr. After a time the Portuguese corvettes arrived there from Kashī. The ruler of Tānūr helped them to go on board the ship and was very good to them as he ought to be. The Portuguese reached Kashī in a state of deep depression.

The Sāmuri took possession of the cannon and other things found in the fort. He pulled down the fort and removed stocks and stones, and left the arid ground. He transported major portion of the stones and timber used in that building to Kālikūt. He also gave some of these material for the purpose of re-erecting, on the old site, the cathedral mosque which the Portuguese destroyed when they built their fort. The ground on which the fort stood and the surrounding area were given to the ruler of Shāliyāt in accordance with the terms of the treaty concluded in the beginning of the war.

After the Sāmūrī took possession of the fort and all that it contained, reinforcements for the Portuguese came from Kūwa by corvettes and ships. But these had to return disappointed by the will of Allāh and His assistance. All these happened because Allāh looked kindly upon us.

#### SECTION 14

##### *The condition of the Portuguese after the capture of Shāliyāt.*

Know then : The accursed Portuguese were in a fit of violent anger, after the subjugation of their fort at Shāliyāt. They were raging at the Sāmūrī and the Muslims and were waiting for an opportunity to destroy the towns of the Sāmūrī and erect fortifications either at Fannān or at Shāliyāt in order that they might harass the Sāmūrī and the Muslims in retaliation for their subjugation of the fort at Shāliyāt. Allāh did not make it easy for them to accomplish their purpose up to the close of the year 987 A.H. (1580 A.D.)

#### 1573 A.D.

But on the 22nd of Shawwāl, 980 A.H., they descended upon Shāliyāt and burnt some houses and shops. In the following year they made a sudden attack upon Barbūrānkād, and in the fight that ensued, four Muslims suffered martyrdom while many died on the side of the enemy. The Portuguese were not disposed to make peace with the Sāmūrī after he captured their fort at Shāliyāt, but cherished ill will towards him and the Muslims, and were lying in wait for an opportunity to attack them.

#### 1577 A.D.

Then in the year 985 A.H. the Portuguese captured nearly fifty corvettes, big and small, which belonged to the Muslims and had been to Talnār to bring rice. Many Muslims suffered martyrdom; nearly three thousand men, Muslims and the companions of Halīs became captives. This defeat for the Muslims reversed the progress of their trade. That is the decree

of Allāh, the All-Powerful and the All-Knowing. No one can understand the wisdom of these except He. But a glorious reward shall be for those who fight in the way of Allāh, suffer martyrdom, and endure with patience all misfortune. We hope that Allāh, glory be to Him, would soon show them a way out and give them sufficient strength to persevere in their course. Allāh will always provide relief to ease and happiness, for He has said :

“So, verily with every difficulty there is relief :  
Verily with every difficulty there is relief.”<sup>30</sup>

In the beginning of the *mawsim* in the same year the Portuguese seized a large number of ships belonging to Jazrāt when they were returning from Jidda to which place they went from Sūrat. Some of these ships belonged to the mighty Sulṭān by name Sulṭān Jalālu'd-Dīn Akbar Bādshāh,<sup>31</sup> and they contained valuable commodities. This wickedness on the part of the Portuguese brought about enmity between them and the Sulṭān. As they expected large profits from the plunder, they did not restore the property for the sake of peace. We hope that Allāh, glory be to Him, would guide Sulṭān Jalālu'd-Dīn Akbar, make him fit for war against the Portuguese and enable him to expel them from the ports like Dēw, Jazrāt, Damūn, Wassā and other places on account of this act of piracy, and then to drive them away from all the ports which they have under their authority. Verily Allāh is All-Powerful and most Competent to answer supplications.

Some of the Muslims who owned corvettes sailed into the river which flows into the port of 'Adilābād. The Portuguese, who wanted to capture them, sailed after them. When they could not capture the corvettes they set fire to the whole harbour intent on burning every vessel that lay there, although some of the corvettes and vessels which belonged to the inhabitants of

30. Qurān, Sūra 94, verses 5 and 6.

31. This was Akbar the Great who was the Mughal emperor between A.D. 1556 and 1605.

Darmfatan, Kannanūr and other places had passes with them. Then they burnt the harbour at Qarāfatan. In consequence of this, the *nāib*<sup>32</sup> at the port of Dābūl captured one hundred and fifty Portuguese men, including their chief officers and brave soldiers by some ruse. Then he put to death many of them, and sent some of them to 'Ādil Shāh.

Sultān 'Ādil Shāh appointed some of his *wazīrs* and troops to watch all the time by Kūwa, in order that they could prevent the inhabitants of that place and other towns from supplying provisions to them. The Sultān dispatched his messenger with letters and presents to 'Alī Ādhrāja, the Sāmuri and the Kōlattirī seeking their assistance in his campaign at Kūwa and blockade against the enemy. When the messenger with his suite and presents arrived at Kūtūkulam, the ruler of that place imprisoned them all. This ruler, who was third in the succession to the Kōlattirī, acted in this manner at the instigation of the Portuguese. But the messenger alone escaped secretly and saved himself. The ruler of Kūtūkulam seized all the goods and presents. Ādhrāja and Kōlattirī sent letters to him demanding of him to return the goods and presents, but of no avail. If the messenger had not fled, he would have delivered him and his followers over to the Portuguese.

This event took place in 986 A.H. (1578 A.D.)

### 1578 A.D.

In that same year some of the Portuguese officers came to the Sāmuri when he was in the temple<sup>33</sup> near Kodungallūr, held sacred among all the unbelievers of Malibār, and talked of peace with him. He agreed to it on the condition that they should build a fort at Kālikūt. But the Portuguese sought permission to build one at Fannān for which the Sāmuri did not agree. Then he sent to Kūwa three responsible men from among his subjects, along with those Portuguese officers who came entreating for peace

32. Dabūl was under Bijāpūr. The name of the *nā'ib* is not known.

33. It was probably the Tirunāvāy temple.

in order that they might discuss the terms of peace. These representatives reached Kūwa in their company. They were received with great honour and respect by Bizrū,<sup>34</sup> the chief of that place, who treated them with kindness and courtesy. Then they returned to the Sāmūrī. The negotiations fell through because the Portuguese wanted to build a fort at Fannān.

This attempt at peace took place in the year 987 A.H.

### 1579 A.D.

In this year (987 A.H.) peace was concluded between 'Ādil Shāh and the Portuguese after they paid him a certain sum of money.

The ruler of Kashī made preparations for war against the Sāmūrī because he' turned him from the temple mentioned above. He collected a large body of men. He also sent letters to Bizrū, the chief of the Portuguese at Kūwa seeking his assistance in his war against the Sāmūrī, in response to which that chief sent a certain number of corvettes. All these joined together and fought against the Sāmūrī, who, in spite of his small army, was able, with the help of Allāh, to defeat the Portuguese and the ruler of Kashī. A large number of the allied forces were slain and put to flight. The Sāmūrī and his followers did not suffer any loss in spite of their small number.

Then the corvettes of the Portuguese set out from Kashī to obstruct the trade journeys of the Muslims, and captured their vessels and corvettes. May Allāh forsake them and chastise them with a severe chastisement!

### 1582-83 A.D.

In the *mawsīm* of the year 990 A.H. or 991 A.H. the Portuguese were very carefully watching throughout the season for the followers of the Sāmūrī who dwelt in Kālikūt, Bandar-

34. The Portuguese Viceroy at Goa in 1578 A.D. was Dom Diego de Menezes.

al-Jadīd, Kābkāt, Fandarīna, Tirkūd and Fannān. In consequence of this, their journeys for trade purposes were completely interrupted and also their intercourse between neighbouring towns. The importation of rice was discontinued from Talnār. A terrible famine came upon them, the like of it was never seen by the people, because the Portuguese stuck to the ports mentioned above, unflinchingly without caring for food. They captured every vessel and corvette, till the Muslims were reduced to narrow circumstances and uttered spontaneously the following verse of the Qurān :

“ .....

Our Lord! Rescue us from this town, whose people are oppressors ; and raise for us from Thee one who will protect ; and raise for us from Thee one who will help.”<sup>35</sup>

During the *mawsīm* in the following year peace was concluded between the Portuguese and the Sāmūrī. The terms were :

- (1) The Portuguese should be permitted to erect a fort at Fannān ;
- (2) the Portuguese should release all the Muslim prisoners in their captivity ;
- (3) the Portuguese should release all the subjects of the Sāmūrī kept by them as prisoners ; and
- (4) the Muslims should deliver to the Portuguese the prisoners of that nation.

The Portuguese delivered immediately to the Sāmūrī the few Muslim captives in their possession. Thus peace was concluded between the Portuguese and the Sāmūrī who permitted them to erect a fort when their chief officer would come to visit him in the following *mawsīm*.

In the beginning of the *mawsīm* which followed the treaty of peace, four vessels arrived from Purtukāl bringing their chief

35. Qurān, Sūra IV, verse 75.

who was appointed by their sultān. Of these four ships, two anchored at Kūwa, and two remained at anchor off Kūlam. The chief of the Portuguese, who was there already, was removed from his office. The new chief<sup>36</sup> and the Sāmuri could not meet each other, for the new chief did not stay at Kālikūt to interview the Sāmuri, but went away to Kūwa. The Sāmuri who made everything ready to receive the new chief and had a fine selection of presents for him, was disappointed. When the new chief reached Kūwa, the Sāmuri sent some of his important men. They had an interview with him and the peace was ratified. The Sāmuri obtained for his subjects permission to carry merchandise to the ports of Jazrāt and other places as in former days and also the privilege to sail in two ships for trade purposes from Kālikūt to the Arabian coast at the end of each *mawsim*.

May Allāh prosper the affairs of the Muslims, repair their losses and fulfil their desire.

Amen

36. After the union of Portugal and Spain in 1580 A.D. Dom Francisco Mascarenhas was appointed first Viceroy of Goa under the new regime.

## A. NAMES OF PLACES AND DIVISIONS IN INDIA\*

‘Ādilābād	perhaps a port near Dabhol	
Bab	Vaipin. An island between the backwater on the east and the Arabian Sea on the west and the Cranganore and the Cochin bars on the north and the south.	വൈപ്പി
Balīnkūt	Balliancota (Ernad Taluk)	വലിയൻകോട്ട
Ballaburam	Vadamalapuram (Cochin State)	വടമലപ്പുറം
Bandar al-Jadīd	(lit. new port). This place cannot be identified.	
Banjāla	Bengal	
Barrūnkād	Pazhayangadi (Cirakkal Taluk)	പഴയങ്ങാടി
Barbūrankād	Parappanangadi (Ernad Taluk).	പരപ്പനങ്ങാടി
Barūj	Broach. Ships from the western countries came, according to the author of the Periplus, to Barugaza or Bharukachchha, the modern Broach, and the merchandise brought by them were thence carried to the inland countries.	
Barūnūr	Parappur (Ernad Taluk)	പരപ്പൂർ
Bāsālūr	Basrur (South Canara District)	
Baytāla	cannot be identified	
Bijānakar	Vijayanagar	

\*The names of places which occur in the text are arranged in the following lists alphabetically, and their identifications are suggested against them.



Budfatan	Valarapaṭṭinam or Balia- paṭam or Azhikkal (Cirakkal Taluk)	വളർപട്ടണം
Dābūl	Dabhol, south of Bombay	
Damūn	port of Daman, north of Bombay	
Darmfatan	Darmadam, ( <i>Dharma- paṭṭinam</i> = the place of charity) an island form- ed by the junction of the Tellicherry and Anjar- akkandi rivers, just north of Tellicherry town. It is sacred to the Malayālis as the place where Cēramān Perumāl took his farewell of Malabar and sailed for Makka in Arabia	ധർമ്മപട്ടണം or ധർമ്മം
Dēw	Diu, in South Gujarat	
Fākkanūr	Barkur (South Canara Dis- trict)	
Fandarīna	Pantalayini, North Malabar	പന്തലായിനി
Fannān	Ponani, South Malabar	പെണ്ണനി
Funna Qāil	Punnai Kāyal (Tinnevely District)	പുണ്ണൈ ക്കായൽ
Hannūr	Honavar (N. Canara Dis- trict)	
Haylī	Mount Delly	ഏഴിമല
Haylī Mārāwī	Mount Delly	Do.
Idakād	Idakkad (North Malabar)	ഐടക്കട്
Janbā	Chambra (North Malabar)	ചമ്പ്ര
Jazrāt	Gujarat	
Jūjārī	perhaps Janjira south of Bombay	
Jurfatan	Srikandapuram (North Malabar)	ശ്രീകണ്ഠപുരം

Kābkāt	Kakkad (North Malabar)	കക്കട്
Kālikūt	Calicut (Malabar)	കോഴിക്കോട്
Kān̄jrakūt	Kasaragod (South Canara)	കാഞ്ഞിരക്കോട്
Kannanūr	Cannanore (North Malabar)	കണ്ണൂർ
Kashī	Cochin	കൊച്ചി
Kodungallūr	Cranganur (Cochin State)	കൊടുങ്ങല്ലൂർ
Konkan	Konkan	
Kūlam	Quilon (Travancore State)	കൊല്ലം
Kumhurī	Cape Comorin (Travancore State)	കുമரி
Kūtūkulam	Kottayam ? (Malabar District)	കോട്ടയം
Kūwa	Goa	
.		
Mahāim	Mahim, north of Bombay	
Malibār	Malabar	മലബാർ
Manjalūr	Mangalore (S. Canara Dist.)	മംഗലാപുരം
Nādhāwaram	Nadapuram (North Malabar)	നാഭാപുരം
Nāk̄fatan	Negapatam (Tanjore District)	நாகபட்டினம்
Nallānballi	Nallepalli (Cochin State)	നല്ലപ്പിള്ളി
Qāil	Kāyal Paṭṭinam (Tinnevely District)	காயல்பட்டினம்
Qarāfatan	Karwar, (N. Canara Dist.)	
Shāliyāt	Chaliyam (South Malabar)	ചാലിയം
Shiyūl	Chaul (Bombay Presidency)	
Shōlamandal	Coramandel	(சோழமண்டலம்)
Silān	Ceylon	(இலங்கை)
Sūrat	Surat (Bombay Presidency)	

Talnār	Talaimannar (Ramnad District)	தலைமன்னார்
Tānūr	Tanur (South Malabar)	താണൂർ
Tirkūd	Tikkodi (Kottayam Taluk, Malabar District)	ടിക്കോടി
Tirkūrī	Tecori (Trikkodi) same as Tikkodi	Do.
Tiruwarankād	Tirurangadi (Ernad Taluk)	തിരൂരങ്ങാടി
Wassā	perhaps Bassein	

## B. NAMES OF PLACES AND COUNTRIES IN WESTERN ASIA AND NORTH AFRICA

'Adan	Aden.
Arabia	Arabia.
Badr	place of a famous battle between the Quraysh and the Prophet of Islām in 624 A.D. see page 30 n.
Hijāz	area comprised by Makkā, Madīna and adjacent territory in Arabia. Arabia Petraea.
Hurmūz	Ormuz in the Persian Gulf.
Jidda	Jedda on the Arabian coast.
Kamrān	a small island in the Red Sea.
Karkar	perhaps a river in Trans- Caucasia to the west of the Caspian Sea.
Khurāsān	Khorasan.
Makhā	cannot be identified.
Makka	a place of pilgrimage in Arabia, the birth place of the Prophet of Islām.
Masqat	Maskat.
Miṣr	Egypt.
Purtukāl	Portugal.
Rūm	Byzantium or Constantino- ple, modern Istanbul.

Shuhr                      see page 37 *n* in this book.

Uḥud                      a place of battle. see p. 27 *n*  
in this book.

Zifār                      a place on the Arabian  
coast.

C. NAMES OF ISLANDS AND COUNTRIES  
IN THE FAR EAST

Āshī	probably Achin, Northern part of Sumatra.
Danāṣrī	probably Danao in the Philippine island.
Jala'a	one of the islands in the Archipelago
Malāqa	Malacca in the Malay Penin- sula .
Malūkū	Molucca island in the Dutch East Indies .
Shamṭara	Sumatra
Sin	China

D. ISLANDS IN THE ARABIAN SEA

Aktī

Amīnī

Amini

Andūr

Dēw-Maḥall

Maldives

Kalfinī

Kaltan

Kanjmanjalā

Kārdib

Malkī

Shaytlākam

## GLOSSARY

*Afranĵ*, the franks, all Europeans.

‘*Āmil*, an agent ; a governor ; an administrator ; a collector of revenue ; an official, officer, functionary.

*Amīr*, commander, governor, lord, prince, noble, chief; a person of rank or distinction.

‘*Arsh*, the highest heaven, the empyrean (where the throne of God is), a throne.

*Barsha* (for *barshat*, pl. *barāsh*), *galiote* (long bateau couvert)  
See R. Dozy, *Supplement aux Dictionnaires Arabes*,  
Tome Premier, p. 72. .

*Dirham*, a silver coin (of which from twenty to twenty-five have at different times passed current for a *dīnār*, which is nearly equal to a *ducat*, or *sequin*, about nine shillings; so that a *dirham* is worth about five pence.)

*Faqīh*, a Muslim lawyer, a theologian.

*Faqīr*, one possessed of one day's sufficiency for self and family (the entirely destitute being called *Miskīn*) ; poor man, beggar, religious mendicant.

*Firdaws*, a garden comprising everything that is in gardens or a garden containing grape-vines; an ample and beautiful garden; a garden containing grape-vines and palm-trees.

It also signifies a valley abounding with herbage, like a garden. In *Qurān*, the word is used in the sense of paradise, (*Sura* 23, verse 11), a garden of trees or a walled garden, or the highest of the stages of paradise or the middle and highest parts of paradise.

*Ghāzī*, one who engages in a warring expedition ; one who fights against unbelievers; a warrior, a conqueror, a hero.



*Ḥadīth*, a tradition or narration relating to or describing a saying or an action of Prophet Muḥammad. See note in p. 13 in this book.

*Hājī* (for *hājj*), a pilgrim to Makka; one who has performed the pilgrimage to Makka.

*Hijra*, (for *hijrat*) flight of Muḥammad, the Prophet from Makka to Madīna (which happened on the 16th of July, 622 A.D., and, in the reign of the *Khalīfa* 'Umar, was ordered to be considered as the commencement of the Muslim era).

*ʿId*, a periodical festival, a festival day.

*Imām*, one who is followed or imitated; exemplar, guide, leader, head; minister of a mosque.

*Janāza*, a bier with a corpse on it; a bier.

*Jihād*, the using or exerting one's utmost power, efforts, endeavours or ability in contending with an object of disapprobation. This is of three kinds, namely, a visible enemy, the devil, and one's self, all of which are included in the term as used in the *Qurān*. The word is used in the text to mean fight against unbelievers, and the like; to fight in the way of Allāh, i.e., in the cause of religion.

*Kalima*, a word, speech, saying; the Islamic confession of faith i.e., "*There is no god worthy of worship but Allāh, and Muḥammad is His prophet.*"

*Mawsim*, season. See note in p. 53 in this book.

*Mu'adhḥin*, muezzin, one who proclaims hours of prayer from minaret.

*Mu'min*, a believer, an orthodox Muslim.

*Nā'ib*, deputy delegate, assistant, lieutenant, viceroy, vicegerent.

*Qaṣr*, shortening of prayer; a person who undertakes a journey to a place which is three days' distant from

his home is permitted to curtail his prayer from four to two *rak'at*.

*Qāzī*, Muslim judge or magistrate, who passes sentence in all cases of law, religious, moral, civil and criminal.

*Sāmūrī*, the Zamorin. See *note* in p. 21 in this book.

*Sayyid*, descendant of Fāṭima daughter of Muḥammad.

*Sharī'at*, Muslim law as derived from the *Qurān*, and the teachings of the Prophet.

*Shaykh*, venerable old man, an elder; a head of a tribe or of a village; the head of a religious confraternity, a doctor of religion and law, a prelate; a reputed saint.

*'Ushūr*, a tenth, a tenth part.

*Wazīr*, vizier, minister of state.



## INDEX

### A

- 'Abdu'l-'Azīz, 6  
 'Abdullāh ibn 'Amr, 32.  
 'Abdullāh ibn 'Amr ibn al-'Ās, 29.  
 'Abdullāh ibn Mas'ūd, 29.  
 'Abdu'l-Muṭṭalib, children of, 20 n.  
 'Abdu'l-Razzāq, 21 n., 37 n.  
 Abū 'Abs, 27.  
 Abū Bakr 'Alī, 76.  
 Abū Dardā', 32.  
 Abu Dā'ūd, 30, 32.  
 Abū Hurayra, 25 and n., 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33.  
 Abū Jahl, 30 n.  
 Abū Ma'shar al-Balkhī, 53 n.  
 Abū Mas'ūd al-Anṣārī, 29.  
 Abū Mūsa, 27.  
 Abū Mūsa al-Ash'hārī, 32.  
 Abū Qays, 28.  
 Abū Sa'id al-Khudrī, 27.  
 Abū Sufyān, 27 n.  
 Abū Umāma, 30, 32.  
 Abyssinians, 81.  
 Accan of Mangāt, 66 n.  
 Achyuta Menon, C., 45 n.  
 'Ad, 78 and n.  
 Adam, 11, 35  
 Adam's Peak, 35 n.  
 'Adan, 58, 62, 75.  
 Aden, 75 n., 76 n.  
 Adhrāja, 'Alī, 76 and n., 80, 85, 91.  
 'Adilābād, port of, 90.  
 'Adil Shāh, Sulṭān (Ismā'il 'Adil Shāh and grandfather of 'Alī 'Adil Shāh), 57 and n., 59 and n.  
 'Adil Shāh, Sulṭān\* 'Alī 'Adil Shāh, 85, 86, 91, 92. See also 'Alī 'Adil Shāh.  
 Ahmad Marakār, 66, 72, 74, 75.  
 Ahmadnagar, Sulṭān of, 63 n., 85 n., Aktī, 80.  
 Alfonso de Albuquerque, Viceroy of the Portuguese, 54 n., 59 n.  
 'Alī, 32, 79.  
 'Alī of Rūm, 78.  
 'Alī 'Adil Shāh, Sulṭān, 14, 57, 59, 85.  
 'Alī al-Ashī, Sulṭān, 81.  
 'Alī Ibrāhīm Marakār, 68, 74, 75.  
 'Alī Rāja, 76 n.  
 al-Kabīr, book of Ṭabarānī, 33.  
 al-Mudkhal-al-Kabīr ilā 'ilm al-Nujūm, 53 n.  
 al-Masiḥu'l-Dajjāl, 31.  
 al-Ṣaḥīḥ, 24 and n.  
 al-Yadh, wazīr, 66.  
 Amīnī,\* 80 and n.  
 Amīr Marjān, 59.  
 Amīr Muṣṭafā, 70, and 70-71 n.  
 Amīr Salmān of Rūm, 57, 58, 64.  
 Anas, 26, 30.  
 Andūr, 80.  
 Añjuvaṇṇam, principality of, 35 n.  
 Arabs' Knowledge of Southern India, 4, 43 n., 50 n.  
 Arabia, voyages to, 54, 62, 63; coast of, 61; privilege to sail to, 94; ports of, 81.  
 Aravidu Dynasty, 59 n.  
 Arayan Kuḷangara Nāyar, 76 n.  
 Āryapuram, 76 n.  
 Āshī, 81.

### B

- Bab, 51.  
 Babar Bādshāh, Mughal Emperor, 72 and n.  
 Badr, battle at, 30 and n.  
 Bahādur Shāh, Sulṭān of Jazrāt, 16, 68, 70 n., 71 and n., 72, 73, 75 n.  
 Bahrām of Constantinople, 70 n.  
 Balinkūt, 51, 56, 65, 68.  
 Ballaburam, 51.  
 Bāṇa, 37 n.  
 Bandar al-Jadīd, 83, 92.  
 Banjāla, 84.

Barrūnkād, 51.

Barūj, 68.

Barūnūr, 51, 65, 74, 87.

Bāsalūr, 81.

Baytāla, 74.

Bethlem, 37 *n.*

Bhāskara Ravi Varman, 35 *n.*

Bidar, Sultān of, 63 *n.*

Bijānakar, 85.

Bijāpūr, 14 *n.*, 57 *n.*, 59 *n.*; Sultān of, 63 *n.*

Birar, Sultān of, 63 *n.*

Bīzrū, 92 and *n.*

booty of war, how distributed, 19.

Buddha, 35 *n.*

Budfatan, 51, 83.

Bukhārī, 24 and *n.*, 27.

## C

Candu Menon, O, 45 *n.*

Calicut, 37 *n.*, 54 *n.*, 85 *n.*

Cannanore, 21 *n.*, 76 *n.*

Cape Comorin, 21 *n.*

Cawnpore, 33 *n.*

Cēramān Perumāl, 37 *n.*, 40 *n.*, 76 *n.*

Chaul, 85 *n.*

Chunar, 71 *n.*

Cirakkal Rāja, 76 *n.*

Cochin, Rāja of, 21 *n.* 54 *n.*

Coļa, 48 *n.*

Commissariat, M. S., 59 *n.*, 71 *n.*, 73 *n.*, 76 *n.*

Companions, definition of, 31 and *n.*

Constantinople, 70 *n.*

Cranganore, 35 *n.*

## D

Dābūl, 91 and *n.*

Damūn, 90.

Danāsrī, 81.

Dārimī, 33 and *n.*

Darmfatan, 37, 38, 41, 51, 65, 67, 79, 91.

Dēw, island and port, 16, 57, 71, 73, 75, 90.

Dēw-maḥall, 79, 81.

Diu, 70 *n.*, 71 *n.*, 73 *n.*, 75 *n.*

Dom Francisco Mascarenhas, 94 *n.*

## E

Egypt, 75 *n.*; Mamlūk rulers of, 57 *n.*

Elayadu of Tēnañcēri, same as al-Yadh, 66 *n.*

## F

Fākkanūr, 38.

Fandarīna, 37, 38, 39, 51, 53, 56, 65, 66, 78, 83, 84, 93.

Fannān, 51, 56, 58, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 76, 78, 79, 83, 84, 87, 89, 91, 92, 93.

Faria Y. Souza, 37 *n.*

Fawcett, F., 46 *n.*, 49 *n.*

Firdaws, 27.

Foot-print of Ādam, 36; pilgrimage to, 35 and *n.*

Francisco, 54 *n.*

Funna Qāil, 79.

Fuḏalāt ibn 'Ubayd, 30.

## G

*Geographical Dictionary of Yāqūt*, 6. *Ghawrī*, Qānṣū-al-*Ghawrī*, Sultān of Miṣr, 57 and *n.*, 58, 58 *n.*

Goa, 59 *n.*, 85 *n.*; inquisition at, 60 *n.*; viceroy of, 94 *n.*

Golkonda, Sultān of, 63 *n.*

Gujarāt, 71 *n.*

## H

Ḥabīb ibn Mālik, 50.

Ḥadhramawt, 78 *n.*

Ḥākīm, 32.

Ḥakīm Shamsulāh Qādirī, 3 *n.*

*Hālāsya Māhātmyam*, 37 *n.*

Halis, companions of, 89.

Hannūr, 81.

Ḥāshim, 20 and *n.*

Haylī, 51, 65.

Haylī Mārāwī, 38, 41.

Heras, Rev. H., 59 *n.*

Hijāz, Sulṭān of 58.

*History of Gujarat*, 59 n., 71 n., 73 n., 76 n.

*History of Kerala*, 37 n., 54 n., 77 n.

Holy war, 13; Laws concerning with, 19.

Hūd, Prophet, 78 n.

Humāyūn Bādshāh, Mughal Emperor, 71 n., 72 and n., 73 n.

Hurmūz, fort at, 81.

Ḥusayn, Amīr of al-Ghawrī, 57, 58.

## I

Ibn 'Abbās, 31, 32.

Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, 37 n.

Ibn Māja, 32.

Ibn 'Umar, 33.

Ibrāhīm 'Adil Shāh, 14 n.

Idakād, 41, 51, 65.

Imām Aḥmad, 11.

'Imrān ibn Ḥusayn, 31, 33.

## J

Jābir, 27.

Jābir ibn 'Abdullāh, 32.

Jābir ibn Samura, 28.

Jalā'a, 81.

Jalālud-Dīn Akbar Bādshāh, Mughal Emperor, 90 and n.

Janbā, 51, 65.

Jazrāt, 57, 62, 67, 68, 71, 72, 75, 81, 90; ports of 61, 80, 94; unbelievers of, 83.

Jerusalem, 35 n.

Jidda, port of, 58, 62, 64, 74.

Jihād, 13, 15, 22.

John III, of Portugal, 60 n.

Joseph Rabban, 35 n.

Jūjārī, port of, 68.

Jurfatan, 38, 41.

## K

Kābkāt, 51, 56, 65, 75, 83, 93.

Kalfinī, 80.

Kālikūt, 40, 51, 54, 55, 58, 62, 63, 65, 66, 69, 71, 72, 77, 81, 83, 88, 91, 92,

94; capture of, 64; first arrival of the Portuguese at, 53; fort at, 62.

Kaltan, 80.

Kamrān, 58, 64.

Kanjmanjalā, 80.

Kānjrakūt, 37, 38.

Kannanūr, 41, 51, 55, 56, 59, 62, 64, 65, 75, 76, 79, 84, 85, 88, 91; fort at, 16, 53, 54; Muslims at, 44.

Kārdib, 80.

Karkar, 78.

Kashī, 51, 55, 56, 57, 59, 61, 62, 66, 68, 69, 72, 74, 78, 84, 88, 92; attack on, 55; fort at, 16, 53, 54; ruler of, 15, 43, 77.

*Keralotpatti*, 36 n., 37 n., 76 n.

Kḥurāsān, 39.

Kḥuraym ibn Fātik, 32.

Kḥwāja Ḥusayn Sanjuqdār of Rūm, 72.

Kodungallūr, 35 and n., 38, 39, 40, 51, 65, 74, 76, 91; king of, 36, 38.

Kōlattirī, ruler of Haylī Mārāwī, 41, 80, 91.

Konkan, 81; ports of, 61, 80; unbelievers of, 83.

Kulam, 38, 39, 49, 59, 94; fort at, 53.

Kumhurī, 37, 41.

Kunj 'Alī Marakār, 66, 72, 74, 75.

Kunj Sūfī, 76.

Kutti Bōkar, 84 and n.

Kutti Ibrāhīm Marakār, 68, 74.

Kūtūkulam, 91.

Kūwa, 59, 64, 78, 81, 85, 86, 87, 89, 91, 92, 94; capture of, 16, 53; fort at, 16.

## L

Laccadives, 80 n.

Logan, 40 n.

## M

Madina, 78 n.

*Madras Government Museum Bulletin*, 46 n., 49 n.

Mahāim, 72.

Mahim, 71 n.

Maḥmūd Shāh, Sulṭān of Jazrāt, 56.

Makhā, 70.

Makka, pilgrimage to, 25 and *n.*, 37  
*n.*, 60.

Malabar Marriage Commission, 45.

Malāqa, 81.

Malibār, 12, 13, 15, 21, 22, 35, 36, 38,  
39, 47, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 64, 78, 81,  
91; customs in, 43, 77; first appear-  
ance of the Portuguese in, 53; Islām  
in, 70; islands in, 80; Muslims of,  
39, 60, 72, 81, 85; people of, 39,  
41, 68, 81; rulers of, 37, 43, 63, 77;  
script of, 38; seaports of, 51, 61,  
80; soldiers of, 48; towns of, 65;  
unbelievers of, 36, 62.

Mālik ibn Dīnār, 38, 39, 50.

Mālik ibn Ḥabīb, 39.

Mālik ibn Ḥabīb ibn Mālik, 38.

Malik Iyās, 57, 70 *n.*, 71, 73; *nā'ib* at  
Dēw, 57.

Malik Tughān, 70 *n.*, 71, 71 *n.*

Malkī, 80.

Malūkū, 81.

Mameluke or Slave Dynasty of Egypt,  
*the*, 58 *n.*

Mamlūk, 57, 58 *n.*

Manjalūr, 38, 81.

Manjalūr, river of, 84.

Manual of Malabar, *the*, 40 *n.*

Marakārs, 72, 76.

Marathon, 30 *n.*

Marco Polo, 37 *n.*

Masqat, 81.

Masrūq, 29.

Mas'ūdī, 53 *n.*

Maylāpūr, 81.

Meliapore (Mylapore), 37 *n.*

Miqdād, 11.

Misr, 16, 57, 75.

Muḥammad or Muḥammad 'Alī, 76  
*n.*

Muḥammad 'Alī Marakār, 66.

Muḥammad the Prophet, 11, 13, 15,  
17, 36.

Muslim, 22, 24 and *n.*, 28.

Musnad, Book of Dārimī, 33 and *n.*

Muṭṭalib, 20 and *n.*

Muẓaffar Shāh, Sultān of Jazrāt, 16,  
57.

## N

Nādhāwaram, 51.

Nākfatan, 81.

Nākhudā Mithqāl, 58 and *n.*

Nallānballī, 74.

Nambiyādhar, 69.

Nasā'ī, 31.

Nāyars, various ranks of 49 *n.*

Niẓām Shāh, Sultān, 85 and *n.*, 86.

Nuno da Kunha, Portuguese Vice-  
roy, 73 *n.*

## P

Padmanabha Menon, 37 *n.*, 54 *n.*, 77  
*n.*

Pāndiya, 48 *n.*

Pepper-King, 77 and *n.*, 78.

Periya Purāṇam, 37 *n.*

Persian Gulf, 78 *n.*

Plassey, 30 *n.*

Portugal, 94 *n.*

Portuguese, detestable deeds of *the*,  
16, 53, 60 and *n.*

Purtukāl, 12, 53, 55, 56, 63; people of,  
60.

## Q

Qāil, 74, 79, 81, 84.

Qamariyya, 38.

Qarāfatan, 91.

Qurān, references to, 23 *n.*, 24 *n.*, 61  
*n.*, 68, 73, 76, 79, 79 *n.*, 90, 93.

Quraysh, 30 *n.*

## R

Rakṣas Tangdi, 14 *n.*

Rāmarāja, 14 *n.*

Rander, 71 *n.*

Rās Kumhurī, (Cape Comorin), 6.

Red Sea, 78 *n.*

Rowlandson, Lieut. M. J., 3 *n.*, 8, 37  
*n.*, 60 *n.*

Rūm, 70, 72, 75, 78.

Rūmī Khān, title of Amīr Muṣṭafā,  
71 *n.*

## S

Sa'd, 28.  
 Sahar Mukhal, 37 n.  
*Ṣaḥīḥ*, 33 n.  
 Sahl ibn Sa'd, 27.  
 Ṣāliḥ, Prophet, 79 n.  
 Salīm *Shāh*, Sultān of Rūm, 58 and n., 70 n., 75 n.  
 Salmān, the Persian, 28.  
 Salmān Ra'īs, a Turk admiral, 70 n.  
 Sāmūrī, 15, 16, 17, 21 and n., 39, 41, 43, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 76, 77, 79, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 91, 92, 93, 94; ruler of Kālikūt, 40; power of, 40.  
 Ṣhālīyāt, 39, 51, 65, 69, 70, 71, 72, 81, 84, 86, 87, 88, 89, capture of, 17; fort at, 16; river of, 69.  
 Shamṭara, 81.  
 Sharaf ibn Mālik, 38, 50.  
 Shaykh 'Amir ibn Dā'ud, Sultān of 'Adan, 75, 76 n.  
 Shaykh Zaynu'd-Dīn, 6, 7, 8.  
 Shaytlākam, 80.  
 Shiyūl, 57, 85, 86.  
 Shōlamandal, 84; seaports of, 81.  
 Shuhr, 37 and n., 39.  
 Silān, 35, 36, 75, 76; ports of 81.  
 Sīn, 81.  
 Slaves, Abyssinian, 70 n.  
 Spain, 94 n.  
 Splitting of the moon, 36 and n., 39.  
 St. Thomas, 35 n.  
 Sulaymān, Arab traveller, 37 n.  
 Sulaymān the Magnificent, Sultān of Turkey, 58 n., 75 n.  
 Sulaymān Bāshā, Wazīr of Sultān Sulaymān *Shāh* of Rūm, 16, 75 and n.  
 Sulaymān *Shāh*, Sultān, (same as Sulaymān the Magnificent), 75.  
*Sunan*, 25 n.  
 Sūrat, 68, 71 n.  
 Sword, of the Sāmūrī, 40 and n., 41.  
 Syria, 78 n.

## T

Ṭabarānī, 33.  
 Talnār, 89, 93.  
 Tānūr, 51, 65, 76; ruler of, 67, 69, 71, 72, 74, 87, 88.  
 Temple, (of Tirunāvāy?), 91 and n., 92.  
 Ṭhamūd, 78 and n., 79 n.  
 Tīmoja, 59 n.  
 Tirkūd, 65, 78, 83, 93.  
 Tirkūrī, 51.  
 Tirmīdhī, 30, 31.  
 Tirunāvāy, 91 n.  
 Tiruvañcikkulam, 37 n.; sack of, 40 n.  
 Tiruvidi, king of Vēnād, 21 n.  
*Tiruvilaiyāḍal Purāṇam*, 37 n.  
 Tiruwarankāḍ, 51, 65.  
 Tirwadi, ruler of Kūlam, 41.  
*Toḥfut-ool-Mujahideen*, 7.  
*Traditions*, 13 and n.  
 Treaty, between the Sāmūrī and the Portuguese, 16, 62, 93.  
*Tuhfat-al-Mujāhidīn*, translation into English 60 n.  
 Turkey, Sultān of, 58 n.

## U

Uḥud, battle at, 27 and n., 32.  
 'Umān, 78 n.  
 'Umayr ibn al-Ḥamām, 30.  
 'Uqba ibn 'Amir, 29.

## V

Vaḷluvanād, Rāja of, 21 n.  
 Vatakkēnkūr, Rāja of, 77 n.  
 Vijayanagar, 59 n; kings of, 63 n.

## W

Wā'ila, 33.  
 Wassā, 72, 90.  
 Wazīrs, of 'Alī 'Adil *Shāh*, 86, 91; of Nizām *Shāh*, 86; of the Zamorin, 66 n.  
 William Muir, Sir, 58.  
 Woman, Abyssinian, 81.



**Y**

Yāqūt, 6.  
 Yemen, 70 n., 75 n., 78 n.  
 Yōgi, 50.  
 Yūsuf, a Turk, 79.  
 Yūsuf 'Adil Shāh, of Bījāpūr, 57 n.  
 59 n.

**Z**

Zafar, on the Arabian coast, 37 n.  
 Zamorin of Calicut, 21 n. 40 n., 54n.,  
 66 n., 77 n., 85 n., 87 n.  
 Zamorins, 37 n.  
 Zaynu'd-Dīn, Shaykh, 6, 12. See  
 also Shaykh Zaynu'd-Dīn.  
 Zīfār, 39.

ANNALS  
OF  
ORIENTAL RESEARCH  
UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS

*Editor-in-Chief*

DR. C. ACHYUTA MENON

*Editorial Board*

RAO SAHIB S. VAIYAPURI PILLAI

MR. M. MARIAPPA BHAT

MR. K. RAMAKRISHNAYYA

DR. C. KUNHAN RAJA

DR. S. MUHAMMAD HUSAYN NAINAR



# Annals of Oriental Research

## EDITORIAL BOARD

DR. C. ACHYUTA MENON  
(EDITOR-IN-CHIEF)

*Head of the Dept. of Malayalam*

RAO SAHEB S. VAIYAPURI PILLAI . .

„

*Tamil*

MR. K. RAMAKRISHNAYYA . . .

„

*Telugu*

MR. M. MARIAPPA BHAT . .

„

*Kannada*

DR. C. KUNHAN RAJA . .

„

*Sanskrit*

DR. S. MUHAMMAD HUSAYN NAINAR

„

*Arabic, Persian  
and Urdu*

*Published by the University of Madras*

*Twice a year*

**Annual subscription : Rs. Four**

## CONTENTS

### PAGES

#### TAMIL :

Rāmappaiyan Ammānai

*By Rao Sahib S. Vaiyapuri Pillai* .. 1- 11

Kambar and Kācciyappar

*By R. P. Sethu Pillai* .. 1- 25

Change of Consonants (Contd.)

*By V. Venkata Rajulu Reddiar* .. 13- 24

#### TELUGU :

Inflexion in Dravidian Languages

*By K. Ramakrishnayya\** .. 1- 36

#### KANNADA :

Chandassāram

*By M. Mariappa Bhat* .. 1- 36

On Pampa's Works

*By H. Sesha Ayyangar* .. 73- 76

#### MALAYALAM :

Māvāratam Pāṭṭu

*By Dr. Chelvat Achyuta Menon* .. 1- 24

Some Stages of Love in the views of Alankarikas

*By P. Krishnan Nair* .. 1- 13

#### SANSKRIT :

Poetic Beauty

*By Dr. C. Kunhan Raja* .. 1- 30

Uḍāli's Commentary on the Rāmāyaṇa

*By Dr. V. Raghavan* .. 1- 8

## CONTENTS—(Contd.)

	PAGES
ARABIC, PERSIAN AND URDU :	
Some Tenets of Islam	
<i>By Dr. S. Muhammad Husayn Nainar</i>	.. 1- 13
Indian Air Training Corps	.. 1- 2
Review	.. 3- 4
University Notes	.. 5-
List of Exchanges	.. 7-

## RĀMAPPAIYAN AMMĀNAI: A HISTORICAL BALLAD A SUMMARY

By

RAO SAHIB S. VAIYAPURI PILLAI, B.A., B.L.

This poem deals with Tirumalai Naick's war of A.D. 1637 against Saṭṭaikka Teva II, alias Daṭavāy Setupati. The immediate cause which led to this war is variously given. Mention is made of several acts of insubordination on the part of the Sētupati and of many acts of open hostility. He was also suspected of harbouring a design to become an independent ruler and the time had now come for eradicating this menace which threatened the solidarity of the Naick kingdom. Rāmappaiyan, the famous Daṭavāy, implored for permission to proceed against the Sētupati and, after some hesitation, the Naick king granted him the permission.

Rāmappaiyan repaired to the temple of Śrī Meenāksnī and prayed to be blessed with victory. He met his elder brother, Vayitti iyan, and took leave of him. Then he issued orders to all the paṭegars to follow him with their forces. An immense army was thus collected and at its head, he proceeded in all royal pomp through the spacious streets of Madura. He reached Chinna Maṇvittar Pāṭaiyan, and night falling, he encamped there. A thousand tents were pitched and in the gleaming light, they appeared as a milk-white sea surging and foaming.

The next day, he marched as far as Vāṇṇiyār-k-kōṭṭai and holding a durbar there, summoned the Jayamakkaḷ (lit. victory men), before him and explained to them his intention. The Jayamakkaḷ pressed on his attention the need for great caution in the affair and told him that their former reverses were due to the secret but solid support of the chiefs which the Sētupati received as the protector of Dhanushkōṭi. This only put Rāmapaiyan on his mettle. With increased determination, he rode on his palanquin surrounded by a mounted guard, nine thousand strong. Tiruppūvaṇam was reached and camps were erected on the river-bank, groves and other places. Vigil was kept throughout the night. In the morning, he left Tiruppūvaṇam for Mānāmadurai. On his way, there was a mud fort almost hidden by woods and bushes. Being questioned, the people told him that it was the Rājagambhīran-kōṭṭai

of Māvali-vāṇa-rāya in the country of Aḷagar. Thereupon, the woods and bushes were mowed down, and the large, fine fort emerged into full view. The whole army shouted with joy on this discovery and with enthusiasm, they renewed their march and encamped at Vānara-Vīran-Madurai for the night.

The next morning, the spies of Saḍaikka Tēva sighted this big army and, struck with dismay, hastened to make their report to their master. The news that Rāmappaian, the trusted commander of Tirumalai Naick, was marching against him with a formidable army, did not trouble him in the least. He reminded himself of the victory over the hostile forces at Parambakuḍi, of the chase he gave to Sūrappaia before he captured and beheaded him and of the destruction of Ariṇādri and his forces with the deadly fire of his cannon. He took a vow that he would pluck out the eyes of the thoughtless Brahman who dared to conduct this expedition and drive him through the streets tying a cocoanut to his tuft. At this juncture, a Pāṇḍāram (officiating priest) at the temple of Rāmanāthaswāmi happened to be present and he recounted to him the military achievements of Rāmappaian. This self-appointed counsellor tried to dissuade him from offering battle and warned him of the certain defeat which he was courting. But the warning went unheeded and the Pāṇḍāram, insulted and threatened, went away in anger to the temple.

Saḍaikka summoned his trusted lieutenants, foremost amongst them, his son-in-law Vanniya Tēvan, Aḷagan, Kumāra Aḷagan, Vīcu-koṇḍai Tēva (lit. the Marava of the dangling hair-lock), Pottai Uḍaiyān, Karutta Uḍaiyān, Rāvuttakūttan and several others. He explained to them that the Naick being instigated by Sētupati, the son of Kūtta (செத்தன் பகன் சேதுபதி) had sent this expedition. A war-council was held and Vanniyan was entrusted with the conduct of the forces. Full of contempt for the Brahman who, for want of an accursed village where he could practise his astrological art, took to soldiery as a means of living, the great Vanniya took a vow that he would heap indignities upon indignities on Rāmappaian, mounted his horse named the Confounder of countries (நாடுகலக்கி) and at the head of his army, proceeded on his campaign. He passed Kaḍu-k-kaṁuttūr and Kāḍantakuḍi and while he neared Kāvanūr, the sun set.

The next morning, he divided his army into three detachments. Aḷagan and his son with all the forces belonging to the Chinna-v-Ūḷiyavakuppu were hastened to the fort of Ariyāṇḍipuram; Pottai

Uḍaiyān and Vicu-koṇḍaittēvan with another company were despatched to the fort of Pudukkuḍi; Matattēvan who cleared the way to Madura, Karutta Uḍaiyān and Rāvuttakkūttan were, with all their forces, ordered to the fort of Pogalur. He himself camped and rested at Toṇḍi, guarding the fort of Ilayānguḍi.

The next day, he proceeded to Ariyāṇḍipuram fort and had for the first time a look at the enemy forces. He wondered at the immensity of the army; but the next moment, his pride in his own power asserted itself. He resolved to make a sudden attack on the hostile forces. There was heavy fighting and about 300 men in Rāmappaiyan's army and about 60 men in Vanniyan's army lay dead on the battle-field. Vanniyan won his first victory.

On the morrow, stung to shame by the defeat sustained, Rāmappaiyan made a bigger preparation for a decisive engagement. He called forth his captains both of the infantry and cavalry, about 100 in all, ordered them to dispose their army into 18 divisions and surrounded the Ariyāṇḍipuram fort. The Maravas within the fort were eager to measure their strength against the Naick forces. They came out, divided themselves into five companies and gave battle. There was a furious fight till sunset and victory remained with Vanniya. Three thousand of the Naick's men and three hundred of the Marava's lost their lives.

The day dawned and it found Rāmappaiyan in a sour mood. He praised his enemies and taunted his own soldiers with lack of courage. In their presence, he declared that he would himself seize Saḍaikka and bring him captive to Madura. At the same time Vanniya sent a messenger to Saḍaikka and informed him of the result of the engagement the previous day. Saḍaikka was overjoyed at the news and he was confirmed in his belief that Gods and victory were on his side. He sent an insulting letter of challenge to Rāmappaiyan, who in his turn despatched an equally insulting challenge. Vanniya was apprised of this challenge and another terrible fight at the plains of Pogalur was the result. The Marava forces in six divisions attacked the Naick forces and Vanniyan was again the hero of the day. Riding on his horse, *Ma-pōki* (or *ma-yōgi*), he sowed destruction wherever he went. Seeing this, Rāmappaiyan's son-in-law Koṇḍappaiyan gathered round him the flower of the Naick soldiers and fought like a lion. Before this onslaught, the Marava forces could not stand. They wavered and it looked as if they would ultimately give in. But they soon rallied round their inspiring leader and reinforcement came from Ariyāṇḍipuram and



Kāḍantakuḍi. A fierce battle raged. The Naick forces were put to flight; two hundred horses and ten elephants fell dead and four of the Naick's captains (Virūpākshi, Kāmākshi, Toṇḍama Nāick and Vengama Nāick) fell victims to Vanniyan's sword. Six of the Pālegārs shared the same fate and Vanniyan entered the fort in great triumph. The heavy casualty (3,000 of the Naick and 500 of the Maravas) gave eloquent testimony to the violent fight on the plains of Pogalur.

The next morning Vanniya summoned his brave comrades who were responsible for the victory and loaded them with presents. Leaving the fort in their charge, he started off to join Saḍaikka Tēva at Ramnad (Selhukarai). But on his way, at Attiyūttik-kōṭṭai, he met his father-in-law. Saḍaikka embraced his son-in-law and warmly praised his deeds of valour on the battle-field.

The day next, Rāmappaiyan's forces surrounded Ariyāṇḍipuram fort and the besieged Maravas, fearing danger, escaped in the small hours of the morning and ran as far as Kāḍantakuḍi. The Naick forces pursued in hot haste, crossed Vaigai at Kāḍantakuḍi and encamped at Aṭṭankarai for the night. When it dawned, they proceeded on their march, stopped and encamped at Pāmbārrankara, little suspecting that Saḍaikka was staying at Attiyūttikkōṭṭai near by. The latter heard the news and attacked the Naick forces. In the engagement that followed, Saḍaikka Tēva was wounded and Vanniyan came to the rescue. He clove in twain the Paṭṭāni who dared to raise his hand against Saḍaikka and inflicted a severe defeat on the hostile forces. About three hundred Paṭṭānis were killed on the spot and five thousand men on the Naick's side lost their lives. The camp was looted and the Naick forces took to their heels.

The next day, Saḍaikka was in a sad plight and Vanniyan realised the seriousness of the situation and decided to retreat to Rāmēśwaram. He embarked on boats with his army, treasures, etc., and reached the island along with his uncle Saḍaikka. Rāmappaiyan was for the time being baulked in his design to capture Saḍaikka and for 20 days he stayed with his army at Attiyūttikkōṭṭai, enjoying a much needed rest and planning how to effect his purpose.

One day, while Rāmappaiyan was sitting in state in the 'darbar hall, a messenger came from Madura with a letter from the Naick summoning him immediately to his presence. Along with this was enclosed another letter from the Rāya (Vēnkaṭapati III) to the Naick

requesting him to send a contingent and informing him that the Mughal Padsha, with a body of cavalry thirty thousand strong, had invaded the Rāya's territory and that they had already secured all the mountain passes and fortresses and that the town of Vijayapuram and Velloor had been plundered and looted. Rāmappaiyan, concealing his chagrin as best he could, called his captains and informed them that he would be returning in eight days and that the positions of vantage so far gained (Āttangarai, Pogalur plain, etc.), should be zealously guarded. He traced his way back to Madura, breaking his journey for the night at Mānāmadura.

The next morning he met the Naick and was commanded to proceed north against the Mughal invaders. Accordingly, he took leave and forthwith started on his expedition. At the end of the first day's march, he rested at Tuvarimān. By a forced march of about 7 days, halting on his way at Sōlavandān, Vaḍamadurai, Śrīrangam, Kaṇṇanoor, Ūṭṭattoor, Vālikanḍapuram and Velloor, he reached Vengaloor (Bangalore) where the Rāyar was camping and had an interview with him. Being fully informed of the real state of affairs, Rāmappaiyan promised to put to rout the Mughal forces speedily and returned to his camp in the town. He sent messages to Ikkarai Vēṅkaṭakrishnaiya, requesting him to come to his help. The latter arrived in time. The combined army attacked the invaders and inflicted a severe defeat. About 6,000 horses, 60 elephants and 50 camels lay dead on the battle-field and a thousand horses were captured to be sent to Madura as booty. Rāmappaiyan returned victorious to the Rāyar who welcomed him with great joy. A gentle request was made that Rāmappaiyan might for ever stay with the Emperor; but the loyal general got out of the delicate situation by promising that he would not fail to be in attendance on the Rāya whenever there was any real need. Then he was given leave to depart with his booty of 1,000 horses and he proceeded southward, following the route he had already traversed. While at Śrīrangam he made valuable offerings to God Ranganātha. He continued his march and when he reached Piḷḷaipālayam and camped there, the news of his victorious return reached the ears of Tirumalēndra. Vayitti Iyan, the elder brother of Rāmappaiyan, was sent for and preparations were made for according the general a grand reception and for signalling his services with *kanakābhi-shekam* (lit. bath of gold). The ministers, pālegārs and Vayitti Iyan met the victorious general, received him in the name of the Naick king and informed him of the intended honour. But Rāmappaiyan would accept nothing until he subjugated the Maravas and captured Saḍaikka. So he marched to Tiruppūvaṇam and

camped there. The people of Maḍappuram (Sivaganga Taluk) waited on him in a deputation and represented to him their grievances against the Kallars who made their lives and properties insecure. Indignant against the Kallars, Rāmappaiyan went to Mattam Cirukuḍi, a Kaḷḷar settlement, and destroyed it. The Kallars of the place represented to the Naick king what they had suffered and on royal intercession, Rāmappaiyan put an end to his activities against the Kaḷḷar tribe. He then came back to Tiruppūvaṇam and proceeded on his way to Ramnad. When he neared Pogaḷur, he found that the fort still remained uncaptured. Reprimanded and threatened, the besiegers made a desperate effort and captured the fort. Aḷagan and his son Kumara Aḷagan who held out so long against the superior forces of the Naick and who defended the fort so bravely were brought before Rāmappaiyan. They were flayed alive, cut to pieces joint by joint and their wives were forced to carry the pieces in *ōla* bags. For this inhuman act the general is deservedly styled cruel-hearted Ramaiyyan (தொடிய தோடு ராமையன்)

After this, the general resumed his march. He halted at two places Āttankarai-k-kōṭṭai and Vetalai on two succeeding nights and on the third day, he reached Pāmbārrankarai. He came to the sea-shore, looked wistfully across the waters and found the Pāmbanturai-k-kōṭṭai standing in singular strength. He no longer wondered at the resistance offered by Saḍaikkaṇ. But he was equal to the occasion and formed the plan of putting up a causeway across the narrow strait. How the causeway was constructed is naively told and is the one humorous incident in the poem, set against the grim background of ruthless battles.\*

Rāmappaiyan was standing in deep contemplation and at once the idea struck him that it was thereabouts that the Great Rāma

\*About 150 lines are devoted to this incident. Perhaps a realistic account of the construction has to be looked for elsewhere. At p. 357 of Rev. Taylor's Catalogue Raisonné of Oriental Manuscripts in the Government Library, we find the following note on Bettalu Nayakar. 'In his time, Ramappaiyan, general of Tirumala Nayakkar, being about to proceed against the Setupati, called for the said Bettalu Nayakar and gave him orders to construct with his people a bridge at the straits of Pamban; which bridge was built with great labour so that the entire army passed over to the island of Rameswaram; and the Setupati being conquered, Bettalu Nayaker received honorable notice for the great trouble which had fallen to his share. He ruled fifty years.'

of Ayōdhyā built a bridge and crossed over to Lanka. He thought he would emulate the epic hero, build a causeway, and capture his Rāvaṇa, Saḍaikka Tēva. An auspicious day was chosen. The plan was that every one in the army including chieftains and pāle-gārs should all bring stones for the construction. But the latter had serious misgivings and they suspected that Rāmappaiyan might be intriguing with the devil, for, they argued, any one in his right senses would have seen the utter impossibility of the task. They hesitated to begin the work but Rāmappaiyan with his usual sagacity began carrying stones himself. Almost everyone joined in the work and stones were coming in good number. A few of the chieftains could not make up their minds to follow the lead of even their general. But stung by the sarcastic remarks of Rāmappaiyan, they also joined in the common work and with them, all their subordinates and dependants.

The work was progressing merrily and the clumsy manner in which the chieftains (mostly naicks) were carrying their load was a sight indeed! A danseuse who chanced to look at them recalled the usual grandiose gait of these Naick chiefs and could hardly stifle her laughter. She called in her sisters in the profession and jeered at the poor chiefs. Rāmappaiyan came to know of this and dismissing the chieftains, ordered the whole tribe of hetaerae to do a like service. There were 7,000 courtesans and everyone of them was to carry seven stones. A young man of the merchant class happened to notice them in their work and recalling the affected grace and delicacy of these wanton women, broke into uncontrollable laughter. Crimson with shame, the women informed Rāmappaiyan of the ridicule to which they were subjected and the general relieved them of their task and called the whole class of Chēṭṭiyārs resident in the town and yoked them to the work. There were 8,000 Chēṭṭis and they had to carry 10 stones each. A youngster of the mendicant class, often repulsed by the Chēṭṭis when he approached them for alms, took this opportunity of taunting them and he along with his brethren, had to pay the penalty of ridiculing the state service. They were also compelled to bring stones and aid in the construction of the causeway. Thus the work went on rapidly and the causeway was built in seven days.

The news of the construction reached the ears of Vanniyan and he stormed with rage. He considered it a sacrilege to tamper with Rāma's bridge in any way. The big ship *Peṇḍukaḷ nācci* (lit. the queen of womenfolk) was ordered to be rigged out and on it were mounted two big guns Rāma and Lakshmaṇa by name. Vanniyan

went on board with a considerable number of men. A fight took place and the cannon of Vanniyan played havoc among Rāmapaiyan's forces. The courtesans and the Cheṭṭiyārs, the poet takes care to mention, were among the first to take to their heels! Night intervened and the havoc ceased.

The day dawned and with it, Rāmapaiyan was awakened to a full realisation of the serious danger. Unless he secured a naval force, there was no possibility of reducing Saḍaikkān and his confederates to submission. He had to negotiate with the 'Parangis' in various places, Ceylon, Colombo, Kandy, Mannar, Cochin and the neighbouring islands. The poem does not give us details; but there are grounds for supposing that it was with the Portuguese that the negotiations were made.\*

A week or two must have elapsed before the naval forces arrived. The Portuguese owed already a grudge against the Sēṭupati for disallowing them passage through the straits, and now when Rāmapaiyan promised on behalf of his king to make over the island of Rāmēśvaram permanently if they would only assist him in the present enterprise, their general agreed readily to do so. The island of Rāmēśvaram was surrounded on all sides by the hostile crafts of the Parangis. Vanniyan, on hearing this, vowed revenge. His ship Nāḍukalakki (lit. confounder of countries) was brought and the two guns Rāma and Lakshmaṇa were taken on board. Five small craft also were made ready for the fighting men. There was a naval engagement and Vanniyan captured six of the Parangi craft. He returned home crowned with victory.

The scattered Parangis gathered together the next day, surrounded the island and gave battle with renewed energy and the Maravas found it very difficult to hold their own. Saḍaikka learnt of this and told Vanniyan of the imminent danger. This redoubtable warrior mounted his steed Nāḍukalakki and rushed with his

\*The Naique of Madura sent his ambassador, Ramappa to the Viceroy, on the 13th August, 1639, to give an assurance on his account to the King of Portugal that in consideration of the assistance sent him when he wished to take Marava, he undertook to give the king of Portugal a fortress in Pampa called Uthear, or wherever he might desire one, with a Portuguese Captain, 50 Portuguese soldiers, 100 lascars and 3,000 pardos for the maintenance of the same; also to build at his own expense a church at Ramanacor, and seven churches between Bambam (Pamban) and Tommdy (Tondi).—F. C. Danver's Report on the Portuguese Records relating to the East Indies, pp. 43-44.

men to the causeway. Rāmappaiyan also gathered his men and met his foes. The Parangis landed and joined their ally. But they were repulsed with severe loss and such of them as were able to get on board their ships could not escape the deadly fire of the cannon. Thus ended the day's fight and Vanniyan was again the victor.

Even the lion-hearted Rāmappaiyan could hardly stand the series of reverses and he was sorely puzzled to find out means of overpowering the enemy. He planned at last to bombard the enemy both by sea and by land. A large fleet of 500 ships laden with Parangis and the flower of the Naick army were ordered to surround the island of Rāmēśvaram and at the same time, infantry was rushed in from the causeway also. The news of this double operation duly reached the ears of Saḍaikka and Vanniyan. The latter called together the Marava chieftains and reminded them of their duty to avenge the inhuman butchery of Aḷagan and his son. Once more, he mounted his steed Nāḍukalakki and rushed to the causeway with all his forces. The battle raged in all its fury. About 6,000 Maravas were put to the sword and Rāmappaiyan stood in the field thirsting for more blood. The remnant of the Marava forces turned and fled. Vanniyan could not brook this. With a courage and strength hardly equalled, he rushed into the enemy's array and gave a terrible fight. Seventy chieftains and a thousand men of the Naick forces perished. The cannon of the Marava chiefs boomed and hailed destruction on the ships surrounding the island. What was almost a defeat was turned into a victory by the intrepid Vanniyan.

At this contretemps, Rāmappaiyan was furious. He assembled his men and told them that he would hang them all in a line along the banks of the Vaigai River rather than return to Madura without killing Vanniyan and capturing Saḍaikka Tēva. It was no idle threat. So, on the morrow, frantic efforts were made for delivering a final blow. Saḍaikka, hearing of this, called his men together, made them valuable presents and exhorted them to fight bravely for independence. But among the men, he missed the inspiring presence of his son-in-law. Vanniyan was suffering from high fever and the next day, pustules of small-pox broke all over his body. Goddesses were propitiated with offerings and sacrifices. Rāmappaiyan was suspected of having resorted to black art against Vanniyan, and Saḍaikka ordered a Vedic sacrifice to be performed in retaliation. On the fourth day of the sacrifice, abscesses broke out in several places on Rāmappaiyan's body; but the brave general

patiently bore his sufferings and ordered simultaneous actions in three places, near about the Pāmban Port, in the sea and on the causeway. Saḍaikka's forces rose equal to the occasion, fighting and repulsing the enemy. While the fight was in progress, the people attending on Vanniyan were talking about it in his hearing; and the warrior, though he lay on his bed thoroughly exhausted, could not contain himself. He rose with a war-cry and demanded his steed Nāḍukalakki. It came beautifully caparisoned. He asked his men to accoutre him fully and to place him steady on the faithful animal. He proceeded to the causeway in spite of the remonstrances of his father-in-law. The Marava forces waxed in enthusiasm at his appearance and the Naick forces shrank with terror. The fight assumed bigger proportions and at the commencement, the Naick forces had the upper hand. But in a short time, Vanniyan turned the tide. He broke the enemy's rank and with his sword dealt destruction everywhere. Virupākshi Naick, Bom-manna Naick and Toḍḍaṇa Naick were cut to pieces. His guns also were equally destructive. Six thousand men and fifty horses lay dead on the battle-field. The main tent of the Naick was plundered and Vanniyan had his last victory. Exhausted by the fight, he mounted his state elephant and returned home in regal splendour.

Saḍaikka, who was looking expectantly for his son-in-law, rushed forward and embraced him. The great Vanniya was taken to his bed and before he allowed his waist-band to be unfastened, he spoke seriously to his father-in-law about the future. He insisted that Saḍaikka should not rely upon the strength of his army and of his captains and advised him strongly to make peace with Rāmappaivan on proper assurances. Having done this duty, he reclined on his bed and breathed his last. The sorrow of Saḍaikka and his wife—indeed of every one in Sētupati's camp—knew no bounds and Vanniyan's wife performed suttee and immolated herself on his funeral pyre.

The news of Vanniyan's death spread like wild fire and soon reached the ears of Rāmappaivan. He was holding a durbar with the chieftains and nālegārs in full attendance and the news threw him into a commotion of joy. He hardly recovered himself before a messenger from Sētupati appeared with a letter of capitulation. Saḍaikka Tēva was willing to meet the general and treat with him, provided the latter would promise, in the name of his brother Vayitti Iyan, not to molest him. The assurance was given and two *sthānāpathis* were sent along with the messenger. Saḍaikka re-

ceived the *sthānāpathis* with due honours and pressed the letter of assurance to his eyes. Trusting in God, he mounted his palanquin and with all the regal paraphernalia proceeded to Rāmappaiyan's court. Reaching there, he got down from his palanquin, offered his presents and made his obeisance to the general. But the ungenerous Rāmappaiyan took off his turban and insultingly asked Saḍaikka to point out the cocoanut which the latter vowed he would tie to his tuft. All undaunted, the Setupati retorted that he would have done so, had his Vanniyan only lived. Enraged at the words, Rāmappaiyan ordered him to be tied and secured. The object of the Naick general thus fulfilled, he marched back to Madura with the pomp and splendour of a victorious general.

Tirumalai Naick was in his palace and in his august presence, Rāmappaiyan appeared with his prisoner. After warmly welcoming the general, the Naick turned to Saḍaikka and asked him the reason why he remained recalcitrant so long, without paying homage. The Marava replied firmly that, had his Vanniyan been alive, he would not have the privilege of paying homage even now. None too pleased with this turbulent vassal, the Naick ordered him to be put in chains and confined within a dungeon. The prisoner thus disposed, the victor remained to be rewarded. He was bathed in a shower of gold (*kanakābhishēkam*), a long-deferred honour, taken in procession through the spacious streets of the capital, and warmly received by the king in person.

Days passed and one morning, Tirumalai Naick was informed that the fetters on the prisoner's person broke of their own accord in a miraculous way. The Naick was fully convinced that this was the result of divine intervention and ordered the prisoner to be released. Saḍaikka appeared in his presence and received his command to rule as his vassal. On this occasion, the Marava did not fail to express his allegiance. Then, the Naick king gave him presents and permitted him to depart for Ramnad. Accordingly, the Sētopati repaired to Ramnad and by the Grace of God ruled there in great prosperity.





## KAMBAR AND KACCIYAPPAR

By

R. P. SETHU PILLAI

*Senior Lecturer in Tamil*

The article on 'Kambar and Kacciyappar' brings out the several points of resemblance between Kambaramayana and Kandapurana. The central theme in both is the struggle between virtue and vice. Some of the most striking points of similarity in the narration of events and description of situations are elucidated in this article and the appendix gives parallel verses from the epics showing similarity in diction.



# கம்பரும் கச்சியப்பரும்

By

R. P. SETHU PILLAI

## 1. இருவகை அரசு

நல்லரசும் வல்லரசும் இவ்வுலகில் எந்நாளும் உண்டு. நல்லரசு அறநெறியிற் சென்று நெடுங்காலம் நிற்கும். வல்லரசு மறநெறியில் முனைந்து நிலைகுலைந்து அழியும். படைத்திறம்படைத்த வல்லரசுகள் வீழ்ந்துபட்ட வரலாற்றைப் பழங்காவியங்களிற் காணலாம். அரசுக்கர் கோமானாகிய இராவணனும், அசுரர் வேந்தனாகிய சூரனும் வரம்பெற்றுயர்ந்த வல்லரசர்; ஆரினும், ஈரமற்ற நெஞ்சினர்; வீரமே விளைத்துத் திளைத்தவர். இலங்கையில் இராவணன் நிறுவிய அரசு இராமனது வில்லால் அழிந்தது. வீரமகேந்திரத்தில் சூரன் அமைத்த அரசு முருகனது வேலால் முறிந்தது. இலங்கை யழிந்த கதையைக் கம்பர் எழுதிய இராமாயணத்திலும், வீரமகேந்திரம் வீழ்ந்த வரலாற்றைக் கச்சியப்பர் எயற்றிய கந்த புராணத்திலும் விரிவாகக் காணலாம். இரு கதைகளின் போக்கும், கவிஞரின் வாக்கும், ஒற்றுமையுடையனவாகத் தோற்றுவித்தன.

இலங்கைமாதையில் அரசுவீற்றிருந்த இராவணன் நெடுந்தவம் புரிந்தான்; அதன் பயனாகப் பெருவரம் பெற்றான்; வரத்தாலும் வலிமையாலும் செருக்கூற்றாகத் தேவரையும் மூவரையும் வென்றான். மாநில மன்னர் அவன் படைத்திறங் கண்டு அஞ்சி ஒடுங்கி அடிபணிந்தார்கள். இத்தகைய வீரமன்னன், தும்பகநுணன் முதலாய தம்பியரோடும், மேகநாதன் முதலாய மைந்தரோடும் இலங்கையிற் சிறந்து வாழ்ந்தான். வானவர் அந்நாட்டில் வாயடங்கிப் பணிசெய்தனர். எங்கும் அறம் தளர்ந்தது; பாவம் வளர்ந்தது.

இவ்வாறே சூரனும் பெருந்தவம் இயற்றினான்; உண்டங்கள் பலவற்றை ஆளும் வரம் பெற்றான்; விண்ணுலகின்மீது படை யெடுத்து, வானவரைப் பிடித்து வீரமகேந்திரத்தில் சிறைவைத்தான்; சிங்க முகன் முதலாய தம்பியரோடும், பானுகோபன் முதலாய மைந்தரோடும் மன்னர் மன்னனாய் விளங்கினான்.

இவ்வுலகில் மறம் முறுகி அறம் வாடும்பொழுது இறைவன் திரு வருக்கொண்டு தோன்றி, மறத்தினை யறுத்து, அறத்தினை நிலை நிறுத்து வான் என்பது ஆன்றோர் கொள்கை. அதற்கேற்ப, அரசுக்கர் கோன் செய்த கொடுமையால் இராமன் அவதரித்தான். அசுரர் கோன் இழைத்த தீமையால் முருகன் தோன்றுவானாயினான். அறமே உருவாய சிதையைச் சிறையினின்று மீட்பதற்கு இராமனது விற்படை எழுந்தது. சயந்தன் முதலிய வானவரைச் சிறை மீட்பதற்கு முருகனது வேற்படை எழுந்தது. இங்ஙனம் வில்லும் வேலும் அறத்திற்

குத் தணையாக நின்று மறத்தனை அறுத்த சரித்திரம் இரு காவியங்களிலும் விளக்கப்படுகின்றது.

## 2. இரு தங்கையர்

அவ் வல்லாரர் இருவருக்கும் வாய்த்த தங்கையரே அவர் அழிந்தொழிய வழிதேடுவபாராவார். சூர்ப்பணை இலங்கை வேந்தன் தங்கை. அசமுதி, ஞான தங்கை. இருவரும் கண்டதே காட்சி, கொண்டதே தே வர் என் னார். கொன்னைபுடையவர் ; மனம் சென்ற வாழெல்லாம் சென்று வையலிலே திசைத்தவர்.

மூக்கறுட்ட தங்கை : பஞ்சவடிச் சாலையில் அழகெல்லாம் ஒருங்கே வாய்ந்த சீதையைக் கண்டான் சூர்ப்பணை ; அம்மங்கையை இலங்கை வேந்தனிடம் கொண்டு சேர்க்கக் கருதினான் ; இராமன் வெளியே சென்றிருந்த வேலை பார்த்துப்பர்ணசாலையிற் புரூந்து, பதறி நின்ற சீதையைப் பற்றி கொடுத்தப் பறக்கலுற்றான். ஆந் நிலையில் சாலையின் புறத்திற் தின்ற உதவல் புரிந்த இலங்கைவன் வெளிப்பட்டான் ; கரவரும் வன்வெந்துரை கங்கிரின் கூந்தலைப் பற்றி யிழுத்து மூக்கை வாழலாற்றித் திசைதவைய விடுவித்தான்.

மூக்கறுட்ட சூர்ப்பணையின் மனத்தில் சிற்றம் முறுகியெழுந்தது ; இலங்கையில் வாய்த்த உற்றவர் உதவினரை ஒலமிட்டு அழைத்தான் ; “வெள்ளிமாமலை யகாந்த மன்னவா ! என் மூக்கைத்த பகைவனை நோக்காயா ? திசையனை மறுப் பெய்தித்த இசையாளா ! யானடைந்த வளை திர்க்க வாராயா ?” என்று அலறினான் ; “காணிருந்து அரசாளுந் கனகத்தில் ஒரு நரன் புரூந்து என்னை நலிவித்தோ” என்று கதறினான் ; மாற்றார் கூற்றலையே மேக நாதனை நினைந்தான் ; “வானவர் கோன் வலியுழித்த மருதாவோ ! யானடைந்த பழியிலைப் பாராயோ” என்று அரற்றினான் ; இவ்வாறு வருந்தியவழிதும் உதவினர் எவரும் வாராமை கண்டு பெறுபுழிந்தான் ; கானகத்தில் வாழ்ந்த கரனிடம் போந்து, தன் குறையை மொழியிட்டான். அரக்கர் சேலையொடு கரன் முதலாய வீரர்கள் கதித்தெழுந்து, இராமனான் கரும்போர் புரிந்து மாண்டனர். அது கண்ட சூர்ப்பணை அழுத கண்ணும் பெருகிய மூக்குமாய் இராமனனிடம் போந்தான் ; சிதைத்து நின்ற தமையனை நோக்கி, மூக்கிழந்த வரலாற்றைக் கூறலுற்றான் ; “ஐயனே, பஞ்சவடிச் சோலையில் ஒரு பாவையைக் கண்டேன் ; அழகின் கொழுந்தெனத் திகழ்ந்த அம்மங்கை உன்கே மனையாளாக இருக்கத்தக்கவன் என்று கருதினேன் ; அவளை இன்று எடுத்துவர முயன்றேன். அப்போது, மறைவிலிருந்த இராமன் தம்பி, என் தலையைப் பற்றி யிழுத்து, மூக்கறுத்து மானபங்கம் செய்து விட்டான். என் வாழ்வு இன்றி முடிந்தது” என்றான்.

“அன்னவன் தன்னை உன்பாலுயிப்பல் என்றெடுக்க லுற்ற என்னையவ் விராமன் தம்பி இடைபுகுந் திலங்கு வாளால் முன்னைமூக் கரிந்து விட்டான் முடிந்ததென் வாழ்வும் உன்னின் சொன்னபின் உயிரை நீப்பான் துணிந்தனன் என்னச்

[சொன்னான்.]”

தங்கைக்கு நேர்ந்த மானத்தைக் கண்டு மனம் வருந்திய இராவணன், அவன் சொல்லிய மங்கையின் அங்க நலங்களை இறையளவும் மறந்தான் லின் ; அந்தங்கையைய அடைதற்சூரிய வழியை நாடினான் ; மாறு கோலம் புனைந்து பஞ்சவாடிச் சாலையிற் போந்து, தனியாக இருந்த சிறையைக் கவர்த்தெடுத்து அசோகவனத்தில் சிறை வைத்தான்.

சிறையின் எய்திய சிதை, ஊழறக்கமற்று வாடி மயங்கினாள் ; புகை யடைந்த ஓவியப்போல் பொலி விழந்தாள் ; எப்படியும் நாயகன் வருவான் என்று நம்பி அரக்கர்கோன் செய்த சிறுமை யெல்லாம் பொறுத்து, உயிர்தரித் திருந்தாள்.

“வாரா தொழியான் எனும் வண்மையினால்  
ஒரா யிர கோடி இடர்க் குடைவேன்  
தீரா ஒருநாள் கலிசை வமனே  
நாரா யன்கின் தனிநா யகனே ”

என்று வருந்தி யழைத்தாள்.

இங்ஙனம் சிறையிருந்து வருந்திய சிதை வடித்த கண்ணீர் அறப் படையை இலங்கைக்கு வாவழைத்தது.

கையறுபட்ட தீர்க்கை : சூரன் கொடுமைக்கு அஞ்சி, இந்திரன் பொன்னாற் றறிந்து, விபரணரி காட்டையடைத்தான் ; சிவபாங்கு கமழும் சீர்காழிப் பதிலில் ஒரு பூஞ்செயலை மாணத்தது அங்கு இந்திரையோடு தங்கி யிருந்தான். சூரன் ஆட்களில், ஈன முற்று வருந்திய வானவர் இந்திரனிடம் பேசத்து, தம் குறையை முறையிட்டார்கள். வானவர் துபாங்கு கண்டு துரியாத் கோத்தன், ஈனிடம் ஒலமிடப் புறப் பட்டான் ; தனித்திருந்த ஐந்திரையை பாசாததன் காவலில் ஒப்பு வித்து, விடைபெற்றுச் சென்றான். பூஞ்செயலில் தனித்திருந்த தேவியைச் சூரன் தங்கையாகிய அசுமுகி கண்ணுற்றான் ; அவளைச் சூரனிடம் கொண்டு செர்க்கக் கருதினான். அவன் பேசிய தீயமொழிகளைக்கேட்ட தேவி அஞ்சி நடுங்கினாள்.

“பழியும் பார்த்தலை படி இகழ்த்திறம்  
மொழியும் பார்த்தலை முறையும் பார்த்தலை  
வழியும் பார்த்தலை வருவ பார்த்தலை  
இழியும் தீய சொல் இயம்பற் பாலையா ”<sup>1</sup>

என்று

1 இச் செய்யுள் கம்பராமாயணம் மாயசனகப் படலத்திலுள்ள

“பழியிது பாவம் என்று பார்த்தலை, பகரத்தக்க மொழியிவை அல்ல என்பதனார்க்கலை, முல மனமகோக்காய் கிழ்கலை நெஞ்சம் கஞ்சக்கூடா யாநம் மூன்று காறும் அழ்க்கலை எனமபோது என் சுற்றெனலும் அமந்தான் எனலும்.”

என்ற செய்யுளோடு ஒப்பு நோக்கத்தக்கது.

நயந்துரைத்தாள். இங்ஙனம் மாறுபட்டுப் பேசிய மாதை மறித் தெடுத்துச் செல்லத் துணிந்தாள் அசமுகி. ஆந்நிலையில் பூஞ்சோலையின் புறத்தே நின்று காவல் புரிந்த மாசாத்தனின் சேவகனாகிய மாகாளன் வெளிப்பட்டான்; வான மங்கையைத் தொட்டிழுத்த அசமுகியின் கையை வாளால் துணித்திட்டான்.

கையற்ற அசமுகி கதறி அழுதாள். வீரமகேந்திரத்தில் வீற்றிருந்த சூரன் நினைத்தாள்; “மன்னுவோ, மன்னுவோ, யான் பட்ட மானத்தை மதிக்கிலாய்யா? மாற்றார் திறங்குறைத்த முன்னவா, என் கரங்குறைத்த பகைவனைக் காணுமியா?” என்று கதறினாள்; மற்றும் மகேந்திரத்தில் வாழ்ந்த உற்றார் உறவினரை யெல்லாம் ஒருவரின் ஒருவராக நினைந்து ஒலமிட்டாள்; “கதிரவன்ச் சிறைசெய்த மருகாவோ, மருகாவோ, யான் பட்ட குறையினை அறியாமியா? மாயவன் நேமியைப் பொன்னாமைனப் பூண்ட தாரகனை, இன்று மாயாப் பழி பூண்டு நின்றாயே! வாசவன் ஏறிய வாரணத்தை ஒரு கையால் வீசியெறிந்த சிங்கமுக வீரனை, அவ்வானவன் விடுத்த சேவகனால் வந்தடைந்த வசையினைப் பாராமியா?” என்று முறையிட்டாள்; உற்றார் எவரும் வாராமை கண்டு, அற்ற கரத்தோடு அண்ணன் இருந்த இடம் போந்தாள்.

சூரன் வீற்றிருந்த சபையிற் புகுந்து, அசமுகி தனக்கு நேர்ந்த சிறுமையை எடுத்துரைக்கத் தொடங்கினாள். “ஐயன், நின் ஆனைக் கடங்காது, கரந்துறையும் இந்திரையைக் காவிரி நாட்டிலே கண்டீன். நறுமணங் கமழும் சோலையில் தனித்திருந்த அம்மாதை, என்னை வரும்படி அழைத்தேன். அவள் மறுததமையால், உன்னிடம் அவனை எடுத்துவரக் கருதினேன். அப்பொழுது வாசவன் ஏவலால், சோலையைக் காத்து நின்ற காவலன், என் கரத்தை வாளால் அறுத்திட்டான். கரமற்ற எனக்கு இனி உறவாவார் யாரும்ல்லே. ஊனமுற்றோர் உயிர் வாழ்ந்திருத்தல் சனமன்றோ?

“காவல் புரிந்து உலகாளும் அண்ணாவோ அண்ணாவோ கரம்  
[மேன் காண்  
ஏவர் எனக்குறவாவர் ஊனமுற்றோர் இருப்பதுவும் இழக்கே  
[யன்றோ  
ஆவிதனை விடுவேன் நான் அதற்கு முனம் என்மானம்  
[அடுவதையோ  
பாவிபொரு பெண் பிறந்த பயனிதுவோ விதிக்கு என்பால்  
[பகைமற் றுண்டோ”

என்று கண்ணீர் சொரிந்தாள்.

தனக்கு நலம் புரியக் கருதிய தங்கை கையற்றாள் என்று அறிந்து மனங்கொதித்த சூரன், காவிரி நாட்டில் கரந்து வாழ்ந்த வானமங்கையைக் கவர்துவரக் கருதினாள். அவன் கருத்தறிந்த பானு கோபன், தந்தையைவேண்டித் தானே பழிக்குப் பழி வாங்கப்பெறப்

பட்டான் ; காவிரி நாட்டில் அசமுசி காட்டிய பூஞ்சோலையில் இத்திரையைக் காணாது, விண்ணிலகின்மிது படையெடுத்தான். இந்திரன் மைந்தனாகிய சயந்தன், வானவர் படைக்குத் தலைவனாய்ப் பாணுகோபனை எதிர்த்தான். பொன்னாட்டில் நிகழ்ந்த போரால் அசுரர் வென்றார் ; வானவர் தோற்றார். தன் கையகப்பட்ட சயந்தனையும் தேவரையும் சூரனிடம் கொண்டு சென்றான் பாணுகோபன். மைந்தன் திறங்கண்டு மணங்கிழ்ந்த பன்னவன், மாற்றாரனைவரையும் சிறையில் அடைத்து வைத்தான்.

சிறையில் அகப்பட்ட சயந்தன் வாடி வருந்தினான் ; இழந்த நிலையினை எண்ணி எண்ணி ஏங்கினான் ; வானவர்க்கு மீளாந்த வசையினை நினைந்து சாம்பினான் ; தேவர்க்கு முவர்க்கு முதலாய நசன் இரங்கி அருள் செய்தாலன்றிச் சிறையினின்றும் விடுபடுபாறிலலை என்று மூண்டது,

“நாராயணனும் அந்த நான்முகனும் நாடறிய  
பேராதியான பெருமான் உயிர்க் கெல்லாம்  
ஆராயின் நியன்றி யாரே துணையாவார்  
வாராய் தமிழன் உயிரளிக்க வாராயே”

என்று நாற்றிசையும் நோக்கிக் கண்ணீர் வடித்திருந்தான்.

சிறையிருந்த சயந்தன் அல்லற்பட்டு ஆற்றாது அழுத கண்ணீர் வீர மக்கந்தரத்தில் னெற்படையை வடிவழைத்துச் சூரன் செருக்கை அறுத்தது.

### 3. இருபெரும் தூதுவர்

அனுமன் கண்ட இலங்கை : இராபாதுதனாகிய அனுமன் இலங்கையை அடைந்தான். அந்தகரம் வீரபா நகரமாய் விளங்கிற்று. ஆடவர் என்று பெர் படைத்தார் அனைவரும் வீரர்கழலணிந்த காலர் ; கல்லினும் வலிய தோளார் ; படைத்தழும் பெறிய கையர் ; கனலுமிழும் கண்ணர் ; இத்தகைய வீரரைக் கண்ட மாருதி,

“கழலிலாக் காலும் கால அயிலிலாக் கையும் காந்தும்  
அழலிலாக் கண்ணுமில்லா ஆடவரில்லை”<sup>2</sup>

என்று

வியந்து புகழ்ந்தான். போர் வெறி பிடித்த அரசுக்கர் வீரமே பேசுத்தினைத்தனர் ; வீரமே ஸ்ளைக்க விரும்பினர் ; முழப்புண் படாத நாளெல்லாம் வீணாய்க் கழிந்த நாளென்று கருதினர். செல்வம் மலிந்த இலங்கைமா நகரில் பசியால் நலிந்தவரும் பசியால் உழன்றவரும் இல்லை. அரசுக்கர் அனைவரும் கவலையற்று ஆடிப்பாடி அகமகிழ்ந்திருந்தார்கள் ; கள்ளாண்டு களித்திருந்தார்கள்.

அவ்வீரமா நகரில் வானவர் வணங்கிப் பணி செய்தனர். இலங்கையர் கோன் ஆதரித்து வளர்த்த அசோக வனத்தைக் கண்ணினைக்



காக்கும் இமைபோல் காத்து நின்றார் சிலர். அரக்கர்கோன் மாளிகையின், அஞ்சி ஒடுங்கிக் குற்றேவல் செய்தார் சிலர். அக்காட்சியைக் கண்ட இராமதூதன், இராவணன் இயற்றிய தவத்தின் பெருமையை மனபாரப் போற்றினான். அப்பால் அசோகவனத்தில் சிறை யிருந்த சீதையைக் கண்டு அவள் சோகத்தை ஒருவாறு மாற்றினான்.

வீரவாகு கண்ட வீரமகேந்திரம்: முருகன் விடுத்த தூதனாய் வீரவாகு மகேந்திரத்தை யடைந்தான். அந்நகரின் படைத்திறம் அவன் கருத்தைக் கவர்த்தது. வரத்தினிற் பெரியர்; மாய வன்மையிற் பெரியர்; உரத்தினிற் பெரியர்; ஊக்கத்திற் பெரியர் என்று படைவீரரது பெருமையைப் பாராட்டினான். வீரமகேந்திரத்தில் நலிந்து மெலிந்த ஆடவரில்லை. நரம்பெழுந்து உலர்த்தவரும் நரைதிரையுடையவரும் அந்நகரில் இல்லை. வறுமையால் வாடியவர் என்றும் அங்கில்லை. அது கண்ட வீரவாகு நூனியற்றிய தவத்தின் பெருமையை வியந்து புரட்டினான். ஆத்தகைய வீரம நகரில் வானவர் வணங்கி ஏவல் புரிந்தனர். நாள்தோறும் கடலிற்போந்து வளமாரந்த மீன்களைப் பிடித்துத் தலையிற் சுமந்துவரும் பணியைச் சூரன் அரைக்க இட்டிருந்தான். மீனெடுத்துவரும் சுனத்தொழிலை வானவர் வெறுத்தாற் றனார், சூரனது ஆணையை மறுக்கற் கஞ்சி, வழுவாது பணியாற்றி வந்தனர். இவற்றை யெல்லாம் கண்ணுற்ற வீரவாகு சயந்தன் சிறையிருந்த இடத்திற்குச் சென்று, அவனைத் தேற்றினான்.

அனுமன் கண்ட இலங்கை வேந்தன்: அனுமன் அரக்கரை அச்சுறுத்தக் கருதி அசோக வனத்தை அழித்தான்; அது கண்டு சீற்றமுற்று எழுந்த அரக்கர் சேனையைச் சிதைத்தான்; பஞ்ச சேனாதிபதியரைப் பருந்துக்கு விருந்தாக்கினான்; அசினன் குமரனாய் அக்கனை அரை சாந்துப்பால் தரையில் தேய்த்துக் கொன்றான்; இறுதியில், பேகநாதன் விசிப் பாசத்தில் அகப்பட்டு, இராவணன் முன்னே போந்து நின்றான்; குறும்கிழைத்த சூரனது அகப்பட்டதென்று இறுமார்திருந்த வேந்தன் செவிகளில் தண்ணையாட்கொண்ட நாயகன் பெருமையை நன்றாக எடுத்துரைத்தான்; “ஆதியும் அந்தமு மில்லாத இறைவன் அயோத்திமா நகரில் அரசுமரகைத் தோன்றினான்; அப்பாலுக் கப்பாலாய் அமைந்த ஆதி பகவளை கால் தரை தோய நின்றான்: கண்ணுக்கும் எளியன் ஆனான்” என்னும் உண்மையை இனிது உணர்த்தினான்.

ஆயினும் மாருதி யுரைத்த வாய்மை, இறுமார்திருந்த இராவணன் செவிகளில் ஏறவில்லை. அறநெறி தவறிய அரசன் நோக்கி “உன் செல்வம் சிதையாதருக்க வேண்டாமாயின், சீதையை விடுக. உன் ஆவியை ஒரு பொருளாகப் போற்றுவாயாயின், மன்னவன் தேவியை விடுக.” என்று மாருதி உறுதியாக உரைத்தான்.

வீரவாகு கண்ட சூரன்: வீர மகேந்திரத்தை முற்றும் சுற்றிப் பார்த்து, அதன் வீரத் திறத்தனை நன்குணர்ந்த வீரவாகு, சூரன் முன்னே சென்றான். விண்ணினின்றும் இழிந்த பொற்பீடத்திலமர்ந்து, சீற்றங்கொண்ட சூரனிடம் முருகன் பெருமையை அறி

விக்கத் தலைப்பட்டான். “தன்னிக ரில்லாத் தலைவனே முருகனாய்த்  
தோன்றினான் : அண்டங்களனைத்தையும் படைத்தும் காத்தும்  
கர்த்தும் விளையாடும் பரமனே அறுமுகக் கோலங்கொண்டு அழகிய  
பாலனாய் வந்தான்” என்றும் உண்மையை எடுத்துரைத்தான்.

நெறி தவறிய சூரன், அச் செம்மொழியைச் செவியில் ஏற்றானல்  
லன். ஆயினும், பெருமிகமுற்ற பேதையாய் சூரனுக்குக் கட்டுரை  
கூறுதல் கடன் எனக்குருகினான் முருக தாதன். “நீயும் நின்கிளை  
யும் நெடிதுவாழ விருந்புறையாரின், இப்பொழுதே வானவரைச்  
சிறைநினின்றும் விடுக; அறுமுகச் செவ்வேன் அடிபணிக” என்று  
கட்டுரை கூறினான்.

#### 4. வல்லரசர் சபை

இராவணன் சபை: அதுமன் இலங்கையை எரிமடுத்தான்;  
பற்றப் போந்த ஆரக்க வீரரை எற்றியழைந்தான்; மீண்டும் கடல்  
கடந்து இராவணிடம் போந்தான். அதுமன் வைத்த தீயால் இலங்கை  
முற்றும் புகைபண்டிற்று. நெடுமாடங்கள் நெருப்பினால் வெந்து  
நீராயின. அரசர்கள் என்னிறந்தவர் அழிந்தனர். இராவணன் அரசன்  
மனையும் எரிந்தொழிந்தது. ஓடுவாறு நெருப்பின் வேகம் தணிந்ததும்  
மன்னன் அணையல் முன்வினும் அழகுற மாட மாளிகைகள் கட்டி  
முடிந்தன. புதிய மாளிகையில் அரசக்கோன் சபை கூடிற்று மந்  
திரத் தலைவரும், தானைத் தலைவரும், கந்திரத் தலைவரும் வந்திருந்த  
சபையின் நடுவே சூர் அரியசனத்தில் இராவணன் அமர்ந்தான்;  
சுற்று முற்றும் பார்த்தான். அவன் நெஞ்சம் பற்றியெரிந்தது; மான  
மும் சீறமுடும் பனத்தில் மாறி மாறி எழுந்தன; உணர்ச்சி ததும்பப்  
பேசலுற்றான். “ஒரு வானம் வந்து என் வள நகரைச் சுட்டது.  
உற்றார் உறவினர் பட்டினர். அமுதநால் எங்கும் பரந்தது. இவ் வலங்  
கோலத்தினிடையே அரியசனத்தில் என் உடல் அமர்ந்திருக்  
கிறது. மற்றொன்றும் இல்லை என்றாலும் நம் நகரத்தைப் பாழ் செய்த  
குரங்கைப் பற்றிக் கொணர்ந்தோமா? பறித்துப் பறி வாங்கினோமா?  
அவ்வாவரம் இற்றொழிந்தது என்ற சொல்லேனும் பெற்றோமா?  
சீர் குலைந்தது; சிறுமையில் முழுகினோம்” என்று கொதித்துக் கூறி  
னான் கொற்றவன்.

அரசன் அமர்ந்தவுடன் எழுந்தான் சேனைகாவலன்; முறுக்காகப்  
பேசத் தொடங்கினான். “அரசே, உன் பெருந்திறனுக் காற்றாது  
தேவருமடங்கினர். அவர் தலைவராய் மூவரும் ஒதுங்கினர். தான  
வர் தருக்கிழந்தனர். இயக்கர் நிலைகுலைந்தனர். இவ்வாறு பல திறத்  
தாரும் அடங்கிப் பணி செய்ய அரசு வீற்றிருக்கும் நீ, ஒரு வானம்  
வலிமதென்று கூறலாகுமோ? என்றான். படைத் தலைவன் கருத்தை  
ஆதரித்துப் பேசலுற்றான் மந்திரத் தலைவனாய் மகாதரன். “ஐயனே,  
இவ்வாறு பன்னுவதாற் பயனில்லை. எனக்கு விடைகொடுப்பாயாயின்,  
இப்பொழுதே எழுந்து சென்று, குறம்பு செய்த குரங்கை வேரறுப்  
பேன். அவ் விலங்கை இங்கு விடுத்த மானிடரின் உயிர் குடித்து உன்  
பகை முடிப்பேன்” என்று துடுக்காகப் பேசினான்.

இங்ஙனம் தானைத் தலைவனும், மந்திரத் தலைவனும், பிறரும் பேசிய வீர மொழிகளால், இலங்கை வேந்தன் உள்ளம் கிளர்ந்து முறுகி நின்றது. அந்நிலையில் எழுந்தான் விபீடணன். மன்னவனைக் கைகூப்பி வணங்கினான். “ஐயனே, இவ் வளநகரம், ஒரு வானரத்தால் அழிந்த தென்று வருந்துகின்றாயே! உண்மையில் வானரமா இலங்கையை அழித்தது? அசோக வனத்தில் சிறையிருந்து தவம்புரியும் சீதையின் கற்புத்தியன்றோ இச் கடிநகரைச் சுட்டெரித்தது? சீதையைச் சிறையினின்றும் விட்டுவிடு. அந் நங்கையின் நாயகனே உலக நாயகன்; அவனே மூவர்க்கும் முதலாய முழு முதற்பொருள். அருந் தவத்தின் பயகைப் பேராசும் பெருந்திருவும் பெற்றாய்; நெடுங்காலம் வாழ்ந்திருக்கும் வரமும் பெற்றாய்; இச் சீரும் சிறப்பும் நிலைக்க வேண்டுமாயின் சீதையை விட்டருள்வாய்” என்று வேண்டினான்.

வீர வெறி பிடித்த வல்லரசன் செவிகளில் விபீடணன் சொல்லிய சொல் ஏறவில்லை; எதிர்த்துப் பேசிய தம்பியை என்னம் செய்யத் தலைப்பட்டான். “அப்பா, தம்பி, உன் மானிடன் திறமையைக் கூறுவேன் கேள்! மிதிலையில், உருக்துக் கிடந்த வில்லை எடுத்து ஒடித்த வீரன்; வானர நாட்டில் ஒரு ஓட்டை மராமரத்தை அம்பினால் துளைத்த வில்லன்; கூன் விழுந்த ஒரு மாது செய்க சூழ்ச்சியால் அரசிழுந்த கொற்றவன். யான் ஏவிய மாயமான் பின்னே பருண்டு ஓடி, மனை யானைப் பறிகொடுத்த மகிபன். பணிமுடி துறந்தும், மனையானை இழந்தும் மானமின்றி இன்னும் உயிர் சுமந்து திரியும் மானிடன் வலிமையை வேறு யாவிர மதிப்பார்” என்று இழித்துப் பேசினான். அன்றியும் பகைவரது திறமையைப் பாராட்டிய தம்பி, அவரோடு உறவு பூண்டான் என்றும், அவருதனியால், இலங்கையரசைப் பெற ஆசைப்பட்டான் என்றும் குற்றம் சாட்ட முற்பட்டான். தவ நிழைத்த தம்பியை உடனே நாட்டைவிட்டு வெளியேறப் பணித்தான். அக் கடுமொழி கேட்ட விபீடணன், “ஐயனே, உன் நலங்கருதியே இவ்வாறுரைசெய்தேன். நீ உள்ளதை உள்ளவாறு உணர்ந்தாய்லீலை. நின் கருத்துக்கு மாறாகப் பேசத்தகனிந்த என் பிழையைப் பொறுத்தருள்க. நீ பணித்தவாறே போகின்றேன்” என்று இலங்கையை விட்டு அகன்றான்.

சூரன் சபை: முருக தூதனாகிய வீரவாகுவும், மகேந்திர நகரை அழித்தான்; அசுர சேனையைச் சிதைத்தான்; பிடிக்க வந்த அசுர வீரரை அடித்தொழித்து அப்பாற் போந்தான். மான வீரனாய் சூரன் நிகழ்ந்த தறிந்து நெஞ்சங் கொதித்தான். மானிகையில் மந்திர சபை கூடிற்று. சூரன் பேசலுற்றான். “முருகதூதனைவந்த ஒருவனால் இத்திருநகரம் அழிந்தது. அளவிறந்த அசுரசேனை இறந்தொழிந்தது. மாண்டவர் எலும்பு மலையாகக் குவிந்தது. குருதி வெள்ளம் எங்கும் பெருகிற்று. என் ஆணை ஒழிந்தது. உயர்வும் தீர்ந்தது. இந்நகரிற்போந்து சிறுமை செய்த தூதனைப்பற்றிச் சிறையில் அடைத்தேனா? செற்றுச் சிறுமை துடைத்தேனா? வடுப்படுத்தியேனும் விடுத்தேனா? யாதும் செய்திலேன். வசைவெள்ளத்தில் முழுகினேன்” என்று மனங்கொதித்தான் சூரன்.

அப்போது சபையிலிருந்த அமைச்சரும் படைத்தலைவரும் அரசு எனது மனப்பான்மைக் கேற்றவாறு பேசுந்தலைப்பட்டார்கள். அவர்களுள் காலசித்தன் என்பான் எழுந்து சூரனது வீரப்புகழை விளக்குவானாயினான். “அண்டர்கள் அடங்கினர். அரசுக்ர் அஞ்சினர். எட்டுத் திசையிலுள்ள காவலரும் ஏவல்புரிகின்றார். இத்தகைய சூரன் ஆட்சியில் இன்று அசுரர் எளியராம்; பூதர் வலியராம்; இது கலியின் கோலமன்றோ” ? என்று மாற்றாரை ஏளனம் பேசினான். அவன் அமர்ந்தவுடன் சூரன் மகனாய் பாணுகோபன் எழுந்தான்; மிகக்காகப் பேசுவற்றான்; ‘மன்னவா ! இன்றே என்னைப் போகவிடு. நம் பகைவரை முறித்து, வானவரையு மடித்து, நொடிப்பொழுதில் மீள்வேன்’ என்று அறைந்தான்.

இவ்வாறு மந்திர சபையில் எழுந்த வீரமொழிகள் நெருப்பில் வெய்வார்த்தாற்போன்று சூரன் மனத்தில் அமைந்த சேற்றத்திற்கு ஊற்றமளித்தன. அந்நிலையில் அவன் தம்பியாய் சிங்கமுகன் எழுந்தான். சூரனை நோக்கி, “ஐயனே, இதுகாறும் அமைச்சரும் பிறரும் வீரமே பேசினர்; தம் திறமையை விரித்தனர்; மாற்றார் வலிமையை இகழ்ந்தனர்; இவர்களுள் ஒருவரும் அறிவுரை பகர்ந்தாரல்லர். விண்ணவர் நாட்டை நீ வென்று அழித்தப்போது வானவரைப் பிடித்துச் சிறையில் அடைத்தாய். அனனார் துயரம் இன்னும் தீர்ந்தபாடில்லே. அவரது துன்பத்தைத் துடைப்பதற்காகவே முருகன் தோன்றியுள்ளான்; அவன் சிவனார் திருமுகன்; ஆதிப் பரம்பொருளின் தோற்றம். ஞானமே வடிவாய் முருகன் தன்மையை நாமா பேச வல்லோம்? புற்றாய் மரமாய் வற்றிக்கிடந்து அருந்தவம் புரியும் முனிவரும் அவனை அறிந்திலர். இத்தகைய பரம்பொருளைப் பகைத்தவர் பிழைப்பாரோ? நீயும், நின் செல்வமும், சுற்றமும் கேடின்றி வாழ வேண்டுமாயின் வானவரை இன்றே சிறையினின்று விட்டு விடு” என்று வேண்டினான்.

இங்ஙனம் முருகனைப் புகழ்ந்து வானவரைச் சிறையினின்று விட்டுவிடுமாறு நயந்து பேசிய சிங்கமுகனை வெறுத்தான் சூரன். அவன் பரம்பொருள் என்று பாராட்டிய முருகனை ஏளனம் செய்யத் தலைப்பட்டான். சிங்கனை நோக்கி, “அப்பா, தம்பி! பாலுண்ணும் பாலனையா பரமன் என்றாய்? அவன் காற்றில் தள்ளுண்டவன்; நெருப்பில் சூடுண்டவன்; கங்கையாற்றில் தாக்குண்டவன்; சரவணப் பொய்கையில் அலைப்புண்டவன்; வேற்றுத் தாயரிடம் பாலுண்டு விளையாடித் திரிகின்றவன். அந்த நேற்றைப் பாலனையா பரம்பொருள் என நினைந்தாய்? என்றான் சூரன். அவ்வளவில் அடையாது, சிங்கமுகன்மீது குற்றம் சாட்டினான். “நீ என் உடன் பிறந்தாய்; உடல் பெருத்தாய்; நம் குலப்பகைவரை அழிக்க முற்படாது; அவர்க்கு ஆளாயினாய்; அசுரர் மாபெருரிய ஆணைம் இழந்தாய்; மாணந்துறந்தாய்; குலப்பெருமையை அழிக்கப் பிறந்தாய்; என் பகையை யானே வென்று முடிப்ப்பனை; நீ உன் வழியைப் போ” என்று பேசினான். அவ்வரை கெட்டு மனம்வருந்தய சிங்கன், “மன்னவன் வருவதறியாமல் பேசுகின்றான்; அழிந்தாழிய வழி தேடுகின்றான்;

என்னால் இயன்றமட்டும் அவனைத் திருத்த முயன்றேன் ; என் உரையைச் செவியில் ஏற்றானல்லன் ; பேதையரைத் திருத்த முயல்பவர் அவரினும் பேதையரே” என்று மனம்நொந்து அந்நாட்டைவிட்டு அகன்றான்.

## 5. இரு பெரும்போர்

இலங்கைப்போர்—முதல் நாள்: அறப்படைக்கும் மறப்படைக்கும் இலங்கையில் போர்தொடங்கிற்று. முதல் நாள் நிகழ்ந்த போரில் இராவணனே படை யெடுத்து இராமனை எதிர்த்தான். வீரரிருவரும், பரந்த சேனையுடன் கடும்போர்புரிந்தனர். இறுதியாக, இலங்கை வேந்தன் முடியிழந்து, படையிழந்து, மானமும் இழந்து, தன் நகரை நோக்கி நடந்தான்.

மகேந்திரப் போர்—முதல் நாள்: வீரமகேந்திரத்தில் வந்தடைந்த முருகன் சேனையொடு முதல் நாள் போர் புரிந்தான் சூரன் மகனாய் பாணுக்காபன். அன்று நிகழ்ந்த அரும்போரில் மாற்றார் திறமை சூரன் மைந்தனுக்கு நன்றாக விளங்கிற்று. அசுரப்படை யனைத்தும் பறிகொடுத்து, பானமழ்ந்தவனாய், பாணுகோபன் வாயடங்கி, மனமடங்கி மீண்டான்.

மேகநாதன் வீளைத்தபோர்: இராவணன் மைந்தனாய் மேகநாதன், இலங்கையில் நிகரற்ற வீரன் ; வானவரை வென்று வான்புகழ் பெற்றவன் ; இந்திரனை வென்று சிறைபிடித்து, இந்திரசித்தன் என்று பெயர்பெற்றவன். வில்லின் செல்வனாய் இவ்வீரன் சீற்றமுற்று மாற்றாரைத் தாக்கினான். எதிரே நின்ற இலக்குவன் மீது தன் கொடிய படைக்கலங்களை ஒன்றன்பின் ஒன்றாக ஏவினான். அவற்றை அவன் எளிதாகத் தடுத்துவிட்டான். எப்படியும் அன்று பகைவரை வென்றே தீரவேண்டும் என்று கருதிய மேகநாதன் மாயவன்படையைச் சுழற்றி விடுத்தான். கண்டோர் மனங்கலங்கச் சென்ற அப்படை இலக்குவனை வலம்வந்து விலகிப்போயிற்று. அதைக்கண்ட மேகநாதன் மாற்றார் திறத்தை உள்ளவாறுணர்ந்தான்; அவரை வெல்ல முடியாதென்று விளக்கமாக அறிந்தான் ; வெல்லலாகாத பகையை விலக்கிவிட்டால் நல்லதாகுமென்று எண்ணினான் ; அந்நிலையில், போர்க்களத்தினின்று மறைந்து இராவணனிடம் போந்தான் ; மாற்றாரைக்கொன்று வருவான் என்று மனங்கனித்திருந்த மன்னவன் முன்னே, இருகரங்குவித்து நின்று, “ஐயனே, இன்று நிகழ்ந்த போரில், நெடியவனபடையை ஏவினேன். அது முன்னின்ற பகைவனை வலம்செய்து போயிற்று. அதனினும் வலிய படை என்பால் உண்டோ? நம் குலம் செய்த பாவுததாலே கொடும் பகை தேடிக்கொண்டோம். இலக்குவன் இன்னும் சீற்றமுறவில்லை. அவன் சீற்றமுற்றால் இவ்வுலக மூன்றும் ஆற்றுகென்று தோற்றுகின்றது,” என்று ஒன்றையும் மறையாது எடுத்துரைத்தான். அப்பொழுது இராவணன் முகத்தில் செற்றம் செறிந்தது. கண்கள் தழுவெனச் சிவந்து சுழன்றன. மன்னவனது மனநிலை யறிந்த மேக

நாதன், மீண்டும் இறைஞ்சி நின்று “அருமைத் தந்தாய், இவ்வாறு பேசியதால் நான் போருக்கு அஞ்சினேன் என்று கருகிவிடலாகாது. அச்சத்தால் இவ்வண்ணம் உரைத்தேனல்லேன்; உன்பால் வைத்த ஆசையால் உரைத்தேன்; வரம்பெற்றியர்ந்த நீ நெடுங்காலம் வாழ வேண்டும்; நின்செல்வம் அபிரியாதிருக்கவேண்டும் என்னும் ஆசையால் இன்னும் ஒன்று கூறத்தாணிந்தேன்; சிறைப் படுக்கிய சீதையை நீ விடுவாயாயின், மாற்றார் சிற்றந்தீர்வர்; நம் நாட்டை விட்டகல்வர்; நாம் செய்த தீமையும் பொறுப்பார். பகை நீங்கி, நீ பண்புற்று வாழ்வாய்” என்றான்.

அம்மொழி கேட்ட இலங்கை வேந்தன், சிங்கை கலங்கிச் சிற்றந்தலைக்கொண்டான். எதிரே நின்ற மைந்தனை நோக்கிப் “பேதாய், அறியாமற் பேசியை; நீ வென்று வருவாய் என்ற இப்பகையைத் தேடினேன்? என்னோள்வலியை நம்பியே சீதையை எடுத்துவந்தேன். எடுத்துவந்த மங்கையைக் கொடுத்துவிடுதல் ஈனமன்றோ? அமர் புரிந்து, ஆளி துறப்பேனெயன்றி, மாற்றான் கேளியை விடுவேனோ? மானமே உயிரினும் பெரிது; பகழே என் வாழ்வினும் பெரிது; அபியும் கன்மை வாய்ந்த இவ்வுலகில் அபியாது நிற்பது பகழ் ஒன்றே யன்றோ?” என்று வெகுண்டு பேசினான். அவ்வரை கேட்ட மோக நாதன், “கேடுவரும் பின்னே மசுகெட்டுவரும் முன்னே,” என்னும் பழமொழியின் உண்மையை நன்குணர்ந்தான்; போர்க்களத்தில் உயிர் துறத்தலே கடன் எனக் தேர்ந்து மீண்டும் இலக்குவனோடு போர் தொடுத்தான்; இறுதியில் ஆவிதுறந்து அரும்புகழ் பெற்றான்.

பானுகோபன் விளைத்தபோர்: மகேந்திரத்தில் மாற்றார் சேனையைத்தாக்கிய பானுகோபன், தன்னிடமிருந்த படைக்கலங்களை யெல்லாம் எவினை; அவையைனைத்தும் பயனற்றப் போகக்கண்ட நிலையில், மயக்கம் விளைக்கும் மாயப் பெரும்படையை விடுத்தான். அப்படை முருகன் சேனையை மயக்கி, வீரர் அனைவரையும் வாரி யெடுத்து, நன்னீர்க் கடலில் உப்த்தது. அதையறிந்த முருகன், தன் வேற்படையை எவினை. அப்படை விரைந்து போந்து, கடலில் மயங்கிக் கிடந்த வீரரது மயக்கத்தீர்த்து, அவரை மீண்டும் போர்க்களத்திற்குச் சேர்த்தது. இப்புதுமையைக் கண்டான் பானுகோபன். “மாயப்படை இவ்வாறு ஒழிந்தால் வேறு எப்படையால் பகைவரை மாயப்பேன்” என்று மனந்தளர்ந்தான். வேற்படை தாங்கிய வீரனை வெல்லுகல் எவ்வாற்றினும் இயலாதென்று சூரனிடம் சென்று அறிவிப்பானாயினான். “அரசே, மனத்திட்டம் வாய்ந்த மாற்றாரைக் கண்டால், நான் மனமகிழ்வேன்; வினைத்திட்டம் வாய்ந்த வீரரை எதிர்த்தால், ஊக்கம் அடைவேன்; ஆதலால், பகைவர்களுக்கு, இங்ஙனம் பேசினேன் என்று எண்ணிவிடலாகாது. நீ வாழவேண்டும்; அரசாளவேண்டும் என்பதே என் ஆசை; அவ்வாசையால் இன்னும் ஒன்று கூறத்தாணிந்தேன். “வானவரை நீ சிறையினின்றும் விடுவாயாயின், வேலேந்திய முருகன், நம்நாட்டை விட்டகல்வான்; சிற்றம் தீர்வான்; நம் சீர்மையும் சிறப்பும் நிலைகுலையாமல் நெடுங்காலம் நிற்கும்” என்று கட்டுரை கூறினான்.

அவ்வரை கேட்ட சூரன் பொங்கி யெழுந்தான். “மைந்தா, என் முன்னின்று என்ன பேசினாய்? வானவரை விட்டேனென்றால், என்னை யாவரே மதிப்பார்? தேவரும் மூவரும் போற்ற மன்னர் மன்னனாய் வீற்றிருக்கும் என்னிலை என்னையும்? இவ்வலகம் நிலையற்ற தென்பதை நீ யறியாயோ? இளமையும், செல்வமும், சுற்றமும் மற்று யாவும் முடிந்தே தீரும். அந்நியாமல் நிற்பது புகழ் ஒன்றே; ஆதலால், அவி கொடுத்து அருள் புகழ் பெறவேனெயன்றி, வானவரை விடுத்து, வசையினுக்கு அளாவி வாழமாட்டேன்.” என்று உறுதியாகப் பேசினான். தந்தையின் உரைகேட்ட மைந்தன் மனந்தளர்ந்தான்; விதியின் வாழியே அவன் மதி சென்றது என்று எண்ணினான்; மாறாகப் பேசிய பிழை பொறுக்குமாறு மன்னனிடம் மன்றாடினான். மீண்டும் போர்க்களம் போந்தான்; வீரப்போர்புரிந்து வீழ்ந்தான்.

ஹெகிப்போர்: வீரக்கம்பியரும் மைந்தரும் இறந்தபின்னர், இலங்கைவேந்தன், போர்க்கோலம் புனைந்து எழுந்தான்; வரத்தாலும் திறத்தாலும் அன்று மாற்றாரை அழித்து ஒழிக்கத் துணிந்தான்; விண்ணவர் மருள வெம்போர் விளைத்தான். ஆயினும், எதிரே நின்ற இராமன், பதைப்பற அம்பு கொடுத்து நின்றான். அவன் வில்லினின்று எழுந்த சுரபாரி எங்கும் பரந்தா நிறைந்தது. அந்நிலையில் இராவணன் மனக்கிலைமந்த அணாவம்\* சிறிது அகன்றது. மெய்யறிவு சற்றே மிளிர்ந்தது. பகைவனாய் எதிரே நின்ற வீரன் யாவன் என்று திகைத்தான்.

“சிவனே அல்லன் நான்முகன் அல்லன் திருமாலாம்  
அவனே அல்லன் என்மெய் வர மெல்லாம் அடிகின்றான்  
தவனே என்னில் செய்து முடிக்கும் தரனல்லன்  
இவனே யோதான் வேதமுதற் காரணன் என்றான்.”<sup>13</sup>

“என் முன்னே நிற்கும் பகைவன் மும்மூர்த்திகளில் ஒருவனாய், சிவனு யிருக்கலாமோ” என்று சிந்தித்தான். “இத்துணை வலிமை சிவனுக்கும் இல்லையே” என்று அக்கருத்தைத் தவிர்த்தான். “நான்முகன், நாமமும் உருவமும் காந்து வந்து பொருகாடு” என்று நினைந்தான். “எளியனாய் பிரமனுக்கு என்முன் நிற்கும் ஆற்றலும் உண்டோ” என்று எண்ணி அக்கருத்தையும் தள்ளினான். இவ்விருவரும் இல்லையாயின், “இவன் திருமாலோ,” என்று ஐயுற்றான். “இவ்வளவு கடுமையாய் நெடும்போர் புரியுந்திறம் அவனுக்கும் இல்லை” என்று தெளிந்தான். பூவரும், இல்லையென்றால், “அவரினும் அருந்தவம் புரிந்த ஒருவனாய் இருப்பானே” என்று கருதினான். “எத்தகைய தவம் புரிந்தவனாயினும், என்னிலும் பெருந்தவம் இயற்றவல்லவன் ஒருவன் உளனோ? ஆதலால், இவன் தவனும் அல்லன்; பின், யாராயிருத்தல் கூடும்? என் மெய்

வரமெல்லாம் சிதைக்கும் இவ்வீரன், முழுமுதற் பொருளாய இறை வன்தானே"? என்று எண்ணினன். இங்ஙனம் எண்ணி வியந்து நிற்கையில் மீண்டும் அவன் மனத்தில் ஆணவம் படர்ந்தது. மெய் யறிவு அகன்றது. இயல்பாக உள்ள செருக்கும் இறுமாப்பும் வந்து சேர்ந்தன. "என் பகைவன், எவனே ஆயினுமாகு; யான் முன் வைத்த காலைப் பின்வைத்தல் அறியேன்; அமரோபுரிவேன்" என்று ஆரவாரித்துப் படை தொடுத்தான்.

இவ்வண்ணமே முருகனைப் போர்தொடுத்த சூரனும் பலரால் கடும்போர் புரிந்தான். அப்போரின் இடையே, பாலைய் நின்ற வேலன், பார்க்குமிட மெங்கும் நீக்கமற நிறைந்து நின்றான். அக் காட்சியைக் கண்டான் சூரன்.

"கோலமா மன்னை கன்னில் குலகிய சூமரன் கன்னிப் பாலனென் றிருந்தேன் அந்நாள் பரிசிவை உணர்ந்திலேன்யான் மாலயன் தனக்குள் எனை வானவர் தமக்குள் யார்க்கும் மூலகா ரணமாய் நின்ற மூர்த்தி இம் மூர்த்தி யன்றோ"<sup>4</sup>

"ஆயிரகோடி காமர் அமகெலாம் திரண்டொன்றாகி மேயின எனினும் செவ்வேள் விமலமாம் சரணம்கன்னில் தூயநல் லெரிவுக்காற்றா தென்றிடின இனையதொல்லோன் மாயிரு வடிவிற கெல்லாம் உவமை யார் வகுக்கவல்லார்."<sup>5</sup>

என்று ஆற்றவும் வியந்து நின்றான். முருகப் பெருமானது அழகினைக் கண்ணைப் பருகிக் களிப்புற்றான். அப்பெருமானைத் தாள்களால் சூழ் தல் வேண்டும்; கைகளால் தொழுதல் வேண்டும்; நாவினால் துதிக்க வேண்டும் என்று அசைப்பட்டான். அந்நிலையில் மெய்யறிவு பெயர்ந் தது. மாயை மீண்டும் அவன் அறிவை மறைத்தது. எல்லாவகமும் தானேயாகி நின்ற பெருமான், மீண்டும் பாலைய்த் தோன்றினான். சூரன் செருக்குற்றுப் பின்னும் போர்செய்வானாயினான்.

இலங்கை வேந்தனும், மகேந்திர மன்னனும் கண்டோர் வியப் புறக் கடும்போர்புரிந்து வீழ்ந்தனர். இராவணன் மனைவியாய மண்டோ தரியும், சூரன் மனைவியாய பதுமையும், கற்புநெறி வழுவாமல் கணவ னாருடன் சென்றார். வல்லரசுகளை முறித்த வில்லையும் வேலையும் நல்லோர்யாவரும் வாழ்த்தி வழிபடுவாராயினர்.

—:0:—

[கர்ப்பர், கரியப்பர் ஆகிய இருபெருங் கவிஞர் வாக்கிலுள்ள ஒற்றுமைகளைப் பின்வரும் கவிகளிற் காண்க.]

<sup>4</sup> கந்தபுராணம், புத்த, சூரன் வதை. 433.

<sup>5</sup>



## கம்பராமாயணம்

### மூக்கறுபட்ட தங்கை

நீலமாமணி நிற நிருதர் வேந்தனை  
மூலநாசம் பெற முடிக்கும் மொய்ம்பினை  
மேலைநாள் உயிரொடும் பிறந்து தான்வினை  
காலமோர்ந் துடனுறை கடிய நோயனாள்.

(1)

### மூக்கறுத்த முறை

ஊக்கித்தாங்கி விண்படர்வம் என்றுருத் தெழுவானை  
நூக்கி நொய்தினின் வெய்திழையல் எனதுவலா  
மூக்கும் காதும் வெம்முரண் மிகுமார்பமும் முறையால்  
போக்கிப் போக்கிய சினத்தொடும் புரிசூழல் விட்டான்.

(3)

### சூர்ப்பணகையின் ஓலம்

உரன் நெரிந்து விழ என்னை உதைத்து உருட்டி மூக்கரிந்த  
நான் இருந்து தோள் பார்க்க நான் கிடந்து புலம்புவதோ  
கரன் இருந்த வனம் அன்றோ இவை படவும் கடவேனோ  
அரன் இருந்த மலையெடுத்த அண்ணாவோ அண்ணாவோ!

(5)

நசையாலே மூக்கிழந்து நாணம் இலா நான்பட்ட  
நசையாலே நினதுபுகழ் மாசண்ட தாகாதோ  
தசையானே விசைகலங்கச் செருச்செய்து மருப்பொசித்த  
இசையாலே நிறைந்த புயத்து இராவணவோ இராவணவோ!

(7)

## கந்தபுராணம்

கையறுபட்ட தங்கை

மாலுற்றிட வாழ்குரபன் மாவின்கிளை முழுதும்  
மூலத்தொடு முடிவித்திடும் முறையூழ்வினை யென்ன  
சூலத்தினை ஏந்தித்தனி தொடர்துன்முகி யுட்கினை  
ஆலத்தின துருவாம் என ஆங்குற்றனள் அன்றே.

(2)

கைதுணித்தமுறை

போகலும் அதனை ஐயன் பொருநரிற் றலைவன் பாரா  
ஏகுதி போலும் நில்லென் றெய்தியே உடைவாள் வாங்கி  
சேகுறு மனத்தாள் கூந்தல் செங்கையால் பற்றி ஈர்த்துத்  
தோகையைத் தொட்ட கையைத் துணித்தனன் விண்ணோர்

துள்ள. (4)

அசமுகியின் ஓலம்

புரங்குறைத்தும் வலிகுறைத்தும் பொங்கிய தொன்னிலை  
குறைத்தும் புரையுறாத  
வரங்குறைத்தும் புகழ்குறைத்தும் மறையொழுக்கம்  
தனைக்குறைத்தும் மலிசீர்தொல்லை  
உரங்குறைத்தும் வானவரை ஏவல்கொண்டோம் என்றிருபபீர்  
ஒருவன் போந்து என்  
கரங்குறைத்த தறியீர் நாம் நாசி குறைத்தவன் போலும்  
காண்மின் காண்மின். (6)

ஒன்னாதம் சூழ்ச்சியினால் ஒருமுனிவன் என்கிறுவர்  
உயிர்கொண்டுற்றான்  
இந்நாளில் அஃதன்றி ஒருவனைக்கொண்டு எனது கையும்  
இழப்பித்தாரே  
பின்னாள் இவ்வருத்தமுற நன்றாக புரிந்தனையால்  
பிழை நதன்றோ  
மன்னுவோ, மன்னுவோ யான் பட்ட இழிவாவை  
மதிக்கிலாயோ. (8)

கானமதின் இடையிருவர் காதொடு மூக்குடன் அரிய  
மானமதால் பாவியேன் இவண்படியக் கடவுளை  
தானவரைக் கருவறுத்துச் சதங்களைத் தளையிட்டு  
வானவரைப் பணிகொண்ட மருகாஃவா மருகாஃவா !

(9)

ஒருகாலத் துலகேழும் உருத்தெரியத் தனுவொன்றால்  
திருகாத சினம்திருகத் திசையனைத்தும் செலுநறி  
இருகாலிற் புரந்தரனை இருந்தளையின் இடுவிதத  
மருகாவோ மானுடவர் வலிகாண வாராய்யா !

(9a)

மரனையும் நெடுங்காளில் மறைந்துறையும் தாபதர்கள்  
உரனைய்யா, அடல அரக்கர் ஓய்வைய்யா உற்றெதிர்த்தார்  
அரனைய்யா அயனைய்யா அரியைய்யா எனும் ஆற்றல  
கரனைய்யா யானபட்ட கையறவு காணைய்யா !

(11)

### அநுமன் கண்ட இலங்கை

அரக்கர் திறம் :—

காயத்தாற் பெரியர், வீரம் கணக்கிலர், உலகம் கல்லும்  
ஆயத்தார், வரத்தின தன்மை அளவற்றார், அறிதல தேற்றா  
மாயத்தார் நகர்க் கெங்கேனும் வரம்பும் உண்டாமே மற்றார்  
தேயத்தார் தேயமச்சுறல தெருவில் ஓர் தெருவிற்சேறல. (13)

விற்படை பெரிதென்கோயான் வேற்படை மிகும் என்கோயான்  
மற்படை உளதென்கோயான், வாட்படை வல்தென்கோயான்  
கற்பணை தண்டு பிண்டிபாலம் என்றினைய கார்த்தும  
நற்படை உளதென்கோயான் நாயகற் குரைக்குமாளில். (15)

மரமடங்கலும் கற்பகம், மனையெலாம கனகம்  
அரமடந்தையர் சலதையர் அரக்கியர்க் கமரர்  
உரமடங்கி வந்துழையராய் உழல்பவர் ஒருவர்  
தரமடங்கு வதன்று இதுதவம செய்த தவமால். (17)

சிறையிருந்த சீதை :—

ஆவியந்துகில் புனைவதொன் றன்றி வேறறியாள்  
துவியனனம் மென்புனல்தைத் தோய்கிலா மெய்யாள்  
தேவுதெண்கடல் அமிழ்துக்காண்டு அனங்கவள் செய்த  
ஓவியம் புகையுண்டதே யொக்கின்ற உருவாள். (19)

பிறைசெய்த சீர்உருவக் குழவியுருக் கொண்டு நாள் பெயர்ந்து  
வானின்  
முறைசெய்த செங்கதிரோன் ஆதபம் மெய் திண்டுதலும்  
முனிந்து பற்றி  
சிறைசெய்த மருகாவோ, மருகாவோ ஒருவன் எனச் செங்கை  
திண்டிக்  
குறைசெய்து போவதுவோ வினவுகிலாய் ஈதென்ன கொடுமை  
தானே. (10)

வையொன்று வச்சிரக்கைப் புரந்தரனைத் தந்தியொடும்  
வான்மீச்செல்ல  
ஒய்பென்று கரத்தொன்றால் எறிந்தனை வீழ்ந்தனை கிடப்ப  
உதைத்தாய் என்பார்  
மெய்யென்று வியந்திருந்தேன், பட்டிமையோ, அவன்தூதன்  
வெகுண்டு வந்து, என்  
கையொன்று தடிந்தனனே சிங்கமுக வீர, இது காண்கிலாயோ.  
(12)

### வீரபாகு கண்ட வீரமகேந்திரம்

அசுரர் திறம் :—

வரத்தினிற் பெரியர், மாயவன்மையிற் பெரியர், மொய்ம்பின்  
உரத்தினிற் பெரியர், வெம்போர் ஊக்கத்திற் பெரியர், எண்ணில்  
சிரத்தினிற் பெரியர், சிற்றச் செய்கையிற் பெரியர், தாங்கும்  
கரத்தினிற் பெரியர் யாரும் காலினிற் பெரியர் அம்மா. (14)

வில்லியற்றுவோர், வாட்படை யியற்றுவோர், வேளும்  
எல்லையில் படை யுள்ளவும் இயற்றுவோர், இகலால்  
மல்லியற்றுவோர் மாயமதியற்றுவோர் மனுவின்  
சொல்லியற்றுவோர் சுண்ணுறு புலந்தொறும் தொகுமால். (16)

நாடிமேலெழத் தசையிலா துலறியே நரையாய்க்  
கோடு பற்றி மூத்தசைந் திடுவோரையும் சுற்றால்  
விடு வோரையும் பிணியுழப் போரையும் மிடியால்  
வாடு வோரையும் கண்டிலம் இது தவ வலியே. (18)

சிறையிருந்த சயந்தன் :—

தேவியன் மரகதம் தெளித்துத் தீட்டிய  
ஒவிய வருவம் மாசுண்ட தன்மையான்  
ஆவியம் புனலற தமரும் காவியம்  
சூவியன் மென்தொடை புலர்ந்த தேயனான். (18a)

அனுமன் இராமன் பெருமை கூறல் :—

அறந்தலை நிறுத்தி வேதம் அருள் சுரந்தமைந்த நீதித்  
திறந்தெரிந் துலகம் பூணச் செந்நெறி செலுத்தித் தீயோர்  
இறந்துக னாறித் தக்கோர் இடர்துடைத்து ஏக விண்டு  
பிறந்தனன் தன்பொற்பாதம் ஏத்துவார் பிறப்பறுப்பான். (19)

மூலமும் நடுவும் ஈறும் இல்லதோர் மும்மைத் தாய  
காலமும் கனக்கும் நீத்த காரணன் கைவில் லேந்திச்  
சூலமும் திகிரி சங்கும் கரகமும் துறந்து தொல்லை  
ஆலமும் மலரும் வெள்ளிப் பொருப்பும்விட்டு அயோத்தி  
வந்தான். (21)

ஆதலால் தன் அரும்பெறற் செல்வமும்  
ஒதுபல் கிளையும் உயிரும் பெறச்  
சீதையைத் தரு கென்றெனச் செப்பினான்  
சோதியான் மகன் நிற்கெனச் சொல்லினான். (23)

இராவணன் சபை :—இராவணன் முன்னுரை

சுட்டது குரங்கு எரி சூறையாடிடக்  
கெட்டது கொடிகர் கிளையும் நண்பரும்  
பட்டனர் பரிபவம் பரந்த தெங்கனும்  
இட்ட இவ்வரியனை இருந்த தென்னுடல். (25)

மற்றில தாயினும் மலைந்த வானரம்  
இற்றில தாகிய தென்னும் வார்த்தையும்  
பெற்றிலம் பிறந்திலம் என்னும் பேறலால்  
முற்றுவ தென் இனிப் பழியின் மூழ்கினோம். (27)

சேனை காவலன் பேச்சு :—

தேவரும் அடங்கினர் இயக்கர் சிந்தினர்  
தாவரும் தானவர் தருக்குத் தாழ்ந்தனர்  
யாவரும் இறைவர் என்றிறைஞ்சும் மேன்மையர்  
மூவரும் ஒதுங்கினர் உனக்கு மொய்ம்பினோய். (29)

மகோதரன் பேச்சு :—

இடுக்கிவண் இயம்புவ தில்லை ஈண்டெனை  
விடுக்குவை யாமெனில் குரங்கை வேரறுத்து  
ஒடுக்கரும் மனிதரை உயிருண்டு உன்பகை  
முடிக்குவன் யான் என முடியக் கூறினான். (31)

வீரவாகு முருகன் பேருமை கூறல் :—

மண்ணாளந்திடும் மாயனும் வனசமேலவனும்  
எண்ணரும் பகல்தேடியும் காண்கிலா திருந்த  
பண்ணவன் துதல் விழியிடைப் பரஞ்சடர் உருவாய்  
உண்ணிறைந்த பேரருளிஞன் மதலையாய் உதித்தான். (20)

முன்னவர்க்கு முன்னாகுவோர் தமக்கும் முற்பட்டுத்  
தன்னை நேரிலா தீசனும் தனிப்பெயர் தாங்கி  
என்னுயிர்க் குயிராய் அருவுருவமாய் எவர்க்கும்  
அன்னை தாதையாய் இருந்திடும் பரமனே அவன்காண். (22)

உறுதி இன்னமொன்றைக்குவம் நீயும் நின் கிளையும்  
இறுதி யின்றியே எஞ்சுதல் வேண்டுமேல் இமையோர்  
சிறை விடுக்குதி இகலினைத் தவிருதி செவ்வேள்  
அறை கழற்றினை அரணம் என்றன்னியே அமர்தி. (24)

சூரன் சபை :—சூரன் முன்னுரை

அழிந்ததித்திருநகர் அளப்பில் தானைகள்  
கழிந்தன செறிந்தது களேபரத் தொகை  
கிழிந்தது பாரகம் கெழீஇய சோரியாறு  
ஒழிந்தது என் ஆணையும் உயர்வும் தீர்ந்ததால். (26)

ஒற்றென வந்த அவ்வொருவன் தன்னையும்  
பற்றிவெஞ் சிறையிடைப் படுத்தினேனலேன்  
செற்றிலன் ஊறதே எனினும் செய்திலேன்  
எற்றினி வசையுரைக் கேறு கூறுகேன். (28)

காலசித்தன் பேச்சு :—

அண்டர்கள் ஒடுங்கினர் அரக்கர் அஞ்சினர்  
எண்டிசைக் கிழவரும் எவல் ஆற்றுவர்  
மண்டமர் அவுணரின் வலியர் பூதராம்  
கண்டனம் இன்றுயாம் கலியின் வண்ணமே. (30)

பாங்கோபன் பேச்சு :—

ஆண்டெனை விடுத்தியேல் அமா தாற்றிட  
மூண்டிடும் அவர்தொகை முறக்கித் தேவராய்  
சுண்டுறு வோரையும் இமைப்பில் வென்றுபின்  
மீண்டிடுவேன் என விளம்பி னுனரோ. (32)

விபீஷணன் பேச்சு :—

எந்தை நீ, யாயும் நீ, எம்முன் நீ, தவம்  
வந்தனைத் தெய்வம் நீ, மற்றும் முற்று நீ  
இந்திரப் பெருந்தகம் இழக்கின்றாய் என  
நொந்தனன் ஆதலின் நாவல்வ தாயினேன். (38)

அணையவன் சிறுவர் எர்பெரும, உன்பகை வரானவரை அம்மா  
இணையர் என்றுணர் தியேல் இருவரும் ஒருவரும் எதிர்கிலாதார்  
முனைவரும் அமரரும் முழுதுணர்ந்தவர்களும் முற்று மற்றும்  
நினைவரும் தகையர் நம்வினையினால் மனிதராய் எளிதின் நின்றார். (35)

இசையும் செய்கையும் உயர்கூலத் தியற்கையும் எஞ்ச  
வசையும் கீழ்பையும் மீக்கொளக் கிளையொடு மடியாது  
அசைவில் கற்பின் அவ்வணங்கை விட்டருளுதி இதன்மேல்  
விசையம் இல்லெனச் சொல்லினன் அறிஞரின் மிக்கோன். (37)

இராவணன் பரிகாசம் :—

ஊனவில் இறுத்து ஓட்டை மராமரத்துள் அம்போட்டிக்  
கூனி சூழ்ச்சியால் அரசிழந்து உயர்வனங் குறுகி  
யான் இழைத்திட இல்லிழந்து இன்னுயிர் சமக்கும்  
மானிடன்வலி நீயலாது யாருளர் மதிப்பார். (39)

விபீஷணன் மீது குற்றம் சாற்றுதல் :—

நண்ணின மனிதரை நண்பு பூண்டனை  
எண்ணினை செய்வினை என்னை வெல்லுமாறு  
உன்னினை அரசின்மேல் ஆசை ஊன்றினை  
திண்ணிதுன் செயல்பிறர் செறுநர் வேண்டுமோ. (41)

அஞ்சினை யாதலின் அமார்க்கும் ஆளலை  
தஞ்சென மனிசர்பால் வைத்த சார்பினை  
வஞ்சனை மனத்தினை பிறப்பு மாற்றினை  
நஞ்சினை உடன்கொடு வாழ்தல் நன்றரோ. (43)

இந்திரசித்தின் முறையீடு :—

நிலஞ்செய்து விசம்பும்செய்து நெடியவன் படை நின்றானை  
வலஞ்செய்து போவதானால் மற்றினி வலியுதண்டே  
குலஞ்செய்த பாவத்தாலே கொடும்பழி தேடிக்கொண்டோம்  
சலஞ்செயின் உலகமூன்றும் இலக்குவன் முடிப்பன்தானே. (45)

சிங்கமுகன் பேச்சு :—

மந்திரத்தரும் தாணையந்தலை வருடம் மகாரும்  
தந்தமக்கியல் வன்மையே சாற்றிய தல்லால்  
இந்திரப் பெருந்திருவுறும் உன் தனக் கியன்ற  
புந்தி சொற்றிலர் இம்மொழிகேள் எனப் புகல்வான். (34)

ஞானந்தான் உருவாகிய நாயகன் இயல்பை  
யானும் நீயுடைய இசைத்து மென்றால் அஃதெளிதோ  
மோனம் தீர்க்கலா முனிவரும் தேற்றிலர் முழுதும்  
தானும் காண்கிலன் இன்னமும் தன்பெருந் தலைமை. (36)

கெடுதல் இல்லதோர் வளனெடு நீயும் நின் கிலையும்  
படுதல் இன்றியே வாழ்தி என் நின்னன பகர்ந்தேன்  
இடுதல் கொண்டிடு சிறையிடைத் தேவரை இன்னே  
விடுதல் செய்குதி என்றனன் அறிஞரின் மிக்கான். (38)

சூரன் பரிகாசம் :—

காற்றில் தள்ளுண்டு நெருப்பினில் சூடுண்டு கங்கை  
யாற்றில் தாக்குண்டு சரவணம் புக்கலையுண்டு  
வேற்றுப் பேரிடம் பாலுண்டு அழுதேனிலையாடும்  
நேற்றைப் பாலனையோ பரம்பொருளென நினைந்தாய். (40)

சிங்கமுகன்மீது குற்றம் சாற்றுதல் :—

மறந்தனை இழந்தனை மானம் நீங்கினை  
சிறந்திடும் அவுணர்தம் சீர்த்தி மாற்றிடப்  
பிறந்தனை ஈண்டொரு பயனும் பெற்றினை  
இறந்தனை போலும் நீ இருந்துளாய் கொலோ. (42)

உரைப்பதென் இனி ஒருவயிற் மென்னுடன் உதித்துப்  
பெருக்கமுற்றனை நங்குலப் பகைஞரைப் பெரிதும்  
நெருக்கலினியே அவர்கள் பாற் பட்டனை நீயே  
இருக்க மற்றொரு தெவ்வரும் வேண்டுமோ எனக்கே. (44)

பாங்கோபன் முறையீடு :—

மாயைதந்த தொல்படையினால் செறுநரை மயக்கித்  
தூயநீர்க்கடல் இட்டனன் சுரர் அது புகல  
ஆயகாலையில் வேல்விடுத்து அவர் தமை மீட்ட  
சேயை வெல்வது கனவிலும் இல்லையால் தெரியின். (46)



ஆதலால் அஞ்சினேன் என்றருளலை ஆசைதான் அச்  
சீதைபால் விடுதியாயின் அணையவர் சீற்றம் தீர்வர்  
போதலும் புரிவர் செய்த தீமையும் பொறுப்பர் உன்மேல்  
காதலால் உரைத்தேன் என்றான் உலகெலாம் கலக்கி வென்றான்.  
(47)

இராவணன் மறுமொழி :—

பேதைமை உரைத்தாய்மைந்த உலகெலாம் பெயரப்பேராக்  
காதை என்புகழினோடு நிலைபெற அமரர்காண  
மீதெழு மொக்குள் அன்ன யாக்கையை விடுவதல்லால்  
சீதையை விடுவதுண்டோ இருபது திண்டோள் உண்டால். (49)

வென்றிலன் என்ற போதும் வேதம் உள்ளளவும் யானும்  
நின்றுளன் ஆவன் அன்றோ மற்றவ் விராமன்பேர் நிற்குமாயின்  
பொன்றுதல் ஒருகாலத்தும் தவிருமோ பொதுமைத் தன்றோ  
இன்றுளார் நாளைமாள்வார் புகழுக்கும் இறுதியுண்டோ. (51)

விட்டனன் சீதை தன்னை என்னலும் வானோர் நண்ணிக்  
கட்டுவதலாற் பின்னை யான் எனக் கருதுவாரோ  
பட்டனன் என்றபோதும் எளிமையிற் படுகிலென்யான்  
எட்டினோடிரண்டு மாய திசைகளை எறிந்து வென்றேன். (53)

கும்பகருணன் இறந்த போழுது இராவணன் புலம்பல் :—

மின்னிலைய வேலோனே யான் உன் விழி காணேன்  
நின்னிலை யாதென்றேன் உயிர்பேணி நிற்கின்றேன்  
உன்னிலைமை ஈதாயின் ஓடைக் கனிந்துநீழ்  
பொன்னுல மீளப் புகாரோ புரந்தரனார். (55)

அண்டத் தளவும் இனைய பகர்ந்தழைத்துப்  
பண்டைத் தன் நாமத்தின் காரணத்தைப் பாரித்தான்  
தொண்டைக் கனிவாய் துடிப்ப மயிர் பொடிப்பக்  
கெண்டைத் தடங்கண்ணாள் உள்ளே கிளுகிளுத்தாள். (57)

இந்திரசித்து இறந்த போழுது இராவணன் புலம்பல் :—

மைந்தவோ எனும் மாமகனே எனும்  
எந்தையோ எனும் என்னுயிரே எனும்  
முந்தினேன் உனை நானுள்ளோ எனும்  
வெந்த புண்ணிடை வேல்பட்ட வெம்மையான். (59)

வெஞ்சமம் செய வல்லவர் கிடைத்திடின மிகவும்  
நெஞ்சகம் தளிர்ப் பெய்துவன் நேரலர் சமருக்கு  
அஞ்சினேன் என்று கருதலை அரசு, நீ இன்னும்  
உஞ்சவைகுதியோ எனும் ஆசையால் உரைத்தேன். (48)

உறுதி ஒன்றினி மொழிசுவன் பொன்னக ருள்ளார்  
சிறை விடுக்குதி நம்மிடைச் செற்றம் தகற்றி  
அறுமுகத்தவன் வந்துழி மீண்டிடும் அதற்பின்  
இறுதியில் பகல் நிலைக்கும் நின் பெருவளம் என்றான். (48a)

சூரன் மறிமொழி :—

என்னிவை உரைத்தாய் மைந்த இன்று யான் எளியனாகிப்  
பொன்னுலகுள்ள தேவர் புலம்புகொள் சிறையை நீக்கின்  
மன்னவர் மன்னன் என்றே யார் எனைமதிக்கற் பாலார்  
அன்னது மன்றி நீங்கா வசையும்வந் தடையும் மாதேச. (50)

பேரெழில் இளமை ஆற்றல் பெறலரும் வெறுக்கை வீரம்  
நேரரு சுற்றம் யாக்கை யாவையும் நினை வன்றே  
சீரெனப் பட்டதன்றோ நிற்பது செறநர் போரில்  
ஆருயிர் விடினும் வாறோர் அருஞ்சிறை விடுவதுண்டோ. (52)

இறந்திடவரினும் அல்லால் இடுக்கண் ஒன்றுறினும் தம்பாஸ்  
பிறந்திடும் மானந்தன்னை விடுவரோ பெரியர் ஆறோர்  
சிறந்திடும் இரண்டு நாளைச் செல்வத்தை விரும்பி யானும்  
துறந்திடேன் பிடித்த கொள்கை சூரன் என்றொரு பேர்  
பெற்றேன். (54)

சிங்கமுகன் இறந்தபோழுது சூரன் புலம்பல் :—

<sup>1</sup> உண்டுபோர் என்னின் உளங்களிக்கும் உன்னுயிரைக்  
கொண்டுபோனான் இன்று கூற்றன் எனவே கேட்கில்  
தண்டுழாய் மாலும் சதுர்முகனும் இந்திரனும்  
பண்டுபோல் தத்தம் பதியாளப் போகாரோ. (56)

என்னத் தனதண்டம் எங்கும் செவிடுபடத்  
தன்னத் தனியோன் அரற்றும் ஒலி தாங் கேளா  
நன்னத் தவனும் நனினத்தினில் உதித்த  
அன்னத் தவனும் மகத்தவனும் ஆர்த்தனரே. (58)

பாங்கோபன் இறந்தபோழுது சூரன் புலம்பல் :—

மைந்தவோ என்றன் மதகளிரோ வல்வினையேன்  
சிந்தையோ சிந்தை தெவிட்டாத தெள்ளமுதோ  
தந்தையோ தந்தைக்குத் தந்தையிலான் கொன்றனனோ  
எந்தையோ நினை இதற்கோ வளர்த்தனனே. (60)

<sup>1</sup>Cf. நானில மதனில் உண்டு போர் என நவிலின் அச்சொல்  
தேனினும்களிப்புச் செய்யும் சிந்தையர்—கம்பர்

புரந்தரன் பகை போயிற்றோ எனும்  
அரந்தை வானவர் ஆர்த்தனரோ எனும்  
கரந்தை சூடியும் பாற்கடற் கள்வனும்  
நிரந்தரம் பகை நீங்கினரோ எனும்.

(61)

மகளை இழந்த மண்டோதரி புலம்பல் :—

தலையின்மேற் சமந்த கையள் தழுவின்மேல் மிதிக்கின்றாள் போல்  
நிலையின்மேல் மிதிக்கும் தாளள் நேசத்தால் நிறைந்த நெஞ்சள்  
கொலையின்மேற் குறித்த வேடன் கூர்ங்களை உயிரைக் கொள்ள  
மலையின்மேல் மயில் வீழ்ந்தென்ன மைந்தன்மேல் மறுகி  
வீழ்ந்தாள். (63)

கலையினால் திங்கள் என்ன வளர்கின்ற காலத்தே உன்  
சிலையினால் அரியை வெல்லக் காண்பதோர் தவறும் செய்தேன்  
தலையிலா உடலைக் காண் எத்தவம் செய்தேன் அந்தோ  
நிலையிலா வாழ்வை இன்னும் நினைவனோ நினைவிலாதேன் (65)

பஞ்செரி யுற்ற தென்ன அரக்கர்தம் பரவை யெல்லாம்  
வெஞ்சின மனிதர் கொல்ல விளிந்ததே மீண்ட தில்லை  
அஞ்சினேன் அஞ்சினேன் இச்சீதை யென்று அமிழ்தாற்செய்த  
நஞ்சினால் இலங்கை வேந்தன் நானே இத்தகையன் அன்றோ. (67)

இராவணன் இறந்த பொழுது விபீஷணன் புலம்பல் :—

உண்ணாதே உயிருண்ணு தொருநஞ்சு சனகியெனும் பெருநஞ்சு  
உன்னைக்  
கண்ணலே நோக்கவோ போக்கியதே உயிர் நீயும் களப்பட்டாயே  
எண்ணாதேன் எண்ணியசொல் இன்றினித்தான் எண்ணுதியோ  
எண்ணில் ஆற்றல்  
அண்ணவோ அண்ணவோ அசுரர்கள்தம் பிரளயமே அமரர்  
கூற்றே (69)

அன்று எரியின் விழுவேதவதி இவள்காண் உலகுக்கோர்  
அன்னையென்று  
குன்றனைய நெடுந்தோளாய் கூறினேன் அதுமனத்துட்  
கொள்ளாதேயே  
உன்றனது குலமடங்க உருத்தமரிற் படக்கண்டும் உறவாகாதே  
பொன்றினையே இராகவந்தன் புயவலி இன்றறிந்துதான்  
போகின்றாயே (71)

உன் ஆணைக்கஞ்சி உறங்கா துழன்றிடுமால்  
இந்நாள்தனில் நீ இறந்தாய் எனமகிழ்ந்து  
பன்னாகப் பாயல் படுத்திருவர் கால்வருடத்  
தொன்னாள் எனவே கவலை யின்றித் துஞ்சாரோ. (62)

மகனை இழந்த பதுமை புலம்பல் :—

நிலத்தில் வீழ்ந்து சரிந்து நெடுமயிர்  
குலைத்த கையள் குருதி பெய் கண்ணினள்  
அலைத்த உந்தியள் ஆற்றரும் துன்பினள்  
வலைத்தலைப் படும் மஞ்ஞையின் ஏங்கினள். (64)

பண்டே வானம் செந்தழல் மூட்டிப் பகைமுற்றும்  
கொண்டே சென்றாய் அப்பகல் உன்தன் கோலத்தைக்  
கண்டேன் இன்றே இக்கிடைதானும் காண்பேனோ  
விண்டேன் அல்லேன் இவ்வுயிர் தன்னை வினையேனே. (66)

<sup>2</sup> நையா நிற்கும் தேவர்தமக்கும் நனிதுன்பம்  
செய்யா நின்றல் நன்றல தென்றேன் அது தேராதா  
ஐயா நின்னைத் தோற்றனன் மன்னன் அவனும்தான்  
உய்வான் கொல்லோ தன்னுயிர் தானும் ஒழியாதே. (68)

சூரன் இறந்த பொழுது இரணியன்<sup>3</sup> புலம்பல் :—

நன்றென்பதை உணராய் நானுரைத்த வாசகங்கள்  
ஒன்றும் சிறிதும் உறுதியெனக் கொண்டிலையே  
பொன்றும் படிக்கோ பொருதாய் புரவலனே  
என்றுன்னை முன்போல் இருந்திட நான் காண்பதுவே. (70)

பிள்ளைப் பிறைபுனைந்த பிஞ்ஞகன்தன் காதலனைப்  
புள்ளிக் கலாபப் பொறி மயிலாய்ப் போற்றும் எல்லை  
எள்ளற் பொருட்டால் யான்முன் உரைத்த வற்றை  
உள்ளத் திடை. எந்தாய் உன்னுதியோ உன்னாயோ. (72)

<sup>2</sup>Cf. நையா நின்றனன் நான் இருந்திங்கன்  
மெய் வானோர் திருநாடு மேலினாய்  
ஐயா நீ எனதாவி என்பதும்  
பொய்யோ பொய்யுரையுட புண்ணியா—கம்பர். வாலிவதை.  
இரணியன் சூரன் தம்பியான ஒருவன்.



## CHANGE OF CONSONANTS

V. VENKATA RAJULU REDDIAR,

*Junior Lecturer in Tamil.*

This is a continuation of the article which appeared in the previous number of the "Annals." In this, Phonetic changes of certain consonants in *Sandhi* are further discussed.



# மெய்யெழுத்துக்களின் திரிபு

By

V. VENKATA RAJULU REDDIAR,

Junior Lecturer in Tamil

இனி, லகரமெய்யின் திரிபினை நோக்குவோம் :

காம்பு

காம்பு என்பது பூ, இலை இவற்றின் தாளுக்கும் மூங்கிலுக்கும் பெயராய்ப் பயில்கின்றது.

1 'காம்புவேய் மலர்த்தாள் பட்டே கடிமரக் கொம்புநாற்பேர்' என்பது நிகண்டு. இனி, கால் என்பதுவும் பூவின் தாளுக்குப் பெயராய் வழங்கும். இது,

2 'கால் இடம் மரக்கால் பிள்ளை குறுந்தறி வனங் காம்பூற்றம்'

என்னும் நிகண்டினால் அறியலாகும். தாள் என்பதுவும் கால் என்பதுவும் ஒருபொருளில் வழங்குதலானும் பூவின் காம்பிற்குக் கால் என்று வழங்குதல் கூடுமன்றே? இவற்றை நோக்கும்பொழுது, காம்பு என்பது கால் என்னுஞ் சொல்லோடு பு-விசுதி சேர்ந்தமைந்த சொல் எனத் தெரிகின்றது. கால் என்பதனோடு னகரமெய் சேர்ந்திருத்தல் வேண்டும். முதனிலைகளோடு ன்-சேர்தல் உண்டென்பது அயினி (அயில் + ன் + இ), எண் (எள் + ன்) முதலிய சொற்களால் அறியப்படும். அம்முறையில், கால் + ன் + பு = கான்பு ஆகும். கான்பு—காம்பு என்று மருவியுளது. நோன்பு என்பது நோம்பு என்று வழங்குதல் ஈண்டு ஒப்பிடற்குரியது. சொற்களோடு பு—விசுதி சேர்தல் உண்டு. உடல் உடம்பு; புறம்—புறம்பு என்பன காண்க. இனி, காம்பு என்பதன் இடையில் னகரமெய் சேர்ந்திலது எனின், லகரம் னகரமாய்த் திரிந்தது எனல் வேண்டும். லகரம் புவிற்கு இனமாகிய மகரமாய்த் திரிந்தது எனல் பெருநூலாது, நோன்பு என்பதில் அவ்வாறு திரிந்திலாமையானும் நோன்பு என்பதுவே நோம்பு என்று வழங்குதலானும்.

இனி, மூங்கிலைக் குறிக்கும் காம்பு என்னுஞ் சொல், காம்பு என்பதனோடு பு-விசுதி சேர்ந்து அமைந்தது. குறில் முதன்மொழியாகிய

1. குடாமணிநிக. 11 : மகர. 4.

2. ,, 11, லகர. 19.



கழை என்பது மூங்கிற்குப் பெயராய் வழங்குதல் ஈண்டு நினைக்கத் தக்கது.

### 3 'காழ்மண் டெலிகமொடு'

என்னும் அடியில், காழ் என்னுஞ் சொற்குக் காம்பு என்று ஆசிரியர் நச்சினூர்க்கினியர் பொருள் எழுதியிருத்தலும் ஈண்டைக்குக் கருதத்தகும். இவற்றால், லகாரமேபோன்று முகாரமும் திரியும் என்பது அறியப்படும்.

வேறுவேறு பொருளை யுடையதொருசொல் வேறுவேறு முதனிலையி னடியிற் றேன்றி அமைந்திருப்பது காணலாம். 'தொண்டு' என்னுஞ் சொல்லி நோக்குவோம்: இஃது, அடிமைப்பணி என்னும் பொருளில் தொழ் (தொழு) என்னும் முதனிலையினின்று அமைந்ததென மேலே அறிந்தோம். வேலிகளின் இடையேயுள்ள சிறிய வெளியிடத்தைக் குறிக்கும் பொழுது தொள் என்னும் முதனிலையில் அமைந்தது. தொள் + து = தொண்டு. தொண்டு—தொளை (துவாரம்) உடையது. விசுதி வேறுபாட்டால் பொருள் வேறுபடுமாதலின், தொளை, தொண்டு என்பன பொருள் வேறுபட்டன.

இக்கூறியவற்றால், காம்பு என்பது கால், காழ் இவ்விவரண்டு முதனிலைகளினின்றும் அமைதல் கூடும் என்பது அறியலாகும்.

### வேந்து

வேந்து என்பது வேல் என்னுஞ் சொல்லினின்று அமைந்தது எனத் தோன்றுகின்றது. வேல் + து = வேந்து. ஈண்டு லகரம், தகாரத்தின் இனமாகிய நகாரமாய்த் திரிந்துளது. வேந்தன் என்பது வேலையுடையவன் என்னும் பொருளதாகும். வேலினை அரசனுக்கு உடைமை ஆக்கி, வேலோன் என்று கூறுதல் தமிழிற் பெருவழக்கு. கையில் வேலை வைத்துக்கொண்டிராதகாலத்திலும் அரசனை வேலோன் என்று கூறியிருப்பது காணலாம். வேல் என்பது ஒரு வகைப் படை (கருவி)க்கேயன்றிப் படைதட்குப் பொதுப்பெயராய் வழங்குதலும் உண்டு.

### 4 'வேலன்று வென்றி தருவது'

என்னுமிடம் நோக்குக.

வேந்து என்னுஞ் சொற்போன்று, ஏந்து என்பது ஏல் என்பதனடியில் அமைந்ததாகும். ஏல் + து = ஏந்து. இச்சொல், ஏல் என்பதன் பொருளோடு தொடர்புடைய பொருளதநதல் இதனை வலியுறுத்தும். காந்து என்பதில் து—விசுதியாகுமாதலின், அதனுள்

பகுதி யாது என்பது கண்டறியுமிடத்து, அச்சொல், கால் என்பதனடியின் அமைந்தது எனத் தோன்றுகின்றது. கால் என்பது எரியுண்டல், சுடுதல் என்னும் பொருளில் தெலுங்கில் வழங்குகின்றது. அப்பொருளோடு கார்த்துதல் என்னுஞ் சொல்லின் பொருளை ஒப்புநோக்கின், தொடர்புடைமை நன்கு அறியலாகும்.

இதுகாறும் கூறியவற்றால், வேந்து என்னுஞ் சொல்லின் முதனிலை வேல் என்பதாதல் வலியுறும். தேவேந்திரன் என்னுஞ் சொல்லில் வேந்திரன் என்பது அரசனைக் குறிப்ப தெனக் கொண்டு அதனை வேந்தன் எனத் தமிழில் வழங்கினர் என்று கொள்ளுதல் தொல்காப்பியனார்முதலிய தமிழாசிரியர்தம் புலமைக்கும் தமிழ்மரபிற்கும் பொருந்தாதாகும்.

நாக்கு என்னுஞ் சொல் கன்னடத்தில் நாலகே என்றும், தெலுங்கில் நாலுக நால் க என்றும் வழங்குதலின், அதன் முதனிலை நால் என்பதாகும். நால் + கு = நால்கு — நாக்கு. லகாரம் முன்னின்ற ககாரமாய்த் திரிந்தது. இனி, லகாரம் றகாரமாகி நாற்கு என்று வழங்கி, அது பின்னர் நாக்கு என மருவிற்பெனினும் அபையும். எவ்வாறாயினும் நால் என்பதுவே முதனிலை என்றற்கு இழுக்கில்லை. நால் என்பதன் லகாரம் கெட்டு நா என்று வழங்கப்பட்டதாகலாம்.

இனி, வகார மெய்யினை நோக்குவோம் :

கப்பு, தப்பு, துப்பு முதலியன

கப்பு கவறு கவல் கவர் கவை—இவையெல்லாம் ஒரே முதனிலையிற் றோன்றியனவாகும் ; விசுதி வேறுபாட்டால் பொருள் வேறுபடுவ தாயிற்று. கப்பு முதலிய சொற்களின் முதனிலை கவ் என்பதாயிருக்கலாம் எனத் தோன்றுகின்றது. கவ் + பு = கப்பு.

வகரவீறு வல்லெழுத்து வருமிடத்து ஆய்தமாகத் திரியும். இது, 'வேற்றுமையல்வழி ஆய்த மாகும்' (புள்ளிம.84)

என்னுந் தொல்காப்பியச் சூத்திரத்தான் அறியப்படும். இம்முறையில், கவ்பு என்பது கல்பு என்றாகும். கல்பு என்பதில் ஆய்தம் முன்னின்ற பகரம்போன் றெலித்தலின் கப்பு என்றாயிற்று.

கவ் + அல் = கவல் (கவல் + ஐ = கவலை ; கவல் + து =  
கவ் + அர் = கவர் [கவறு]  
கவ் + ஐ = கவை

என, இப்பகுதியினின்று கவல் முதலிய சொற்கள் அமையும். இவ்வாறே,

உவ் + பு = உப்பு  
உவ் + அர் = உவர் (உவர் + இ = உவரி)  
தவ் + பு = தப்பு  
தவ் + அல் = தவல் (தவல் + து = தவறு)  
துவ் + பு = துப்பு  
துவ் + அர் = துவர்

என்று, உப்புமுதலிய சொற்களெல்லாம் உவ் முதலிய வகரவீற்று முதனிலையினின்று அமைந்தனவாகும். இனி, வெப்பு செப்பு (செம்பு) என்பனவும் முறையே வெவ், செவ் என்னும் முதனிலைகளினின்று அமைந்தனவே. இது வெவ்வர், செவ்வை, செவ்வனம், செவ்வது என்னுஞ் சொற்களை நோக்கின் தெளிவாகும்.

கப்பு முதலிய சொற்களில் வகாரம் ஆய்தமாகத் திரியாமலே பகரமாய்த் திரிந்துளது என்று கோடல் அமைதியாகும். ஆயின், வகரம் தன் முன் நிற்கும் வல்லெழுத்தாய்த் திரியும் என்று கொள்ளலாம்.

இனி, ளகரமெய்யினைக்குறித்து ஆராய்வோம் :

### தூம்பு

முதற்கண், தூம்பு என்னுஞ் சொல்லை நோக்குவோம்: தூம்பு என்பது தொலை என்னும் பொருளது. 5 'அந்தூம்பு வள்ளை' என்பது காண்க. 6 'தூம்புடை நெடுங்கை வேழம்' என்புழியும் இப்பொருளதே. தூம்பு என்பதில் பு—விசுதியாகலின் அதனுள் பகுதியாவது யாது என்று நோக்குவோம். தொலை என்னும் பொருளில் துலை என்னும் வழுவமும் வழங்குகின்றது. தொலை என்பதன் முதனிலையாகிய தொள் என்பது முதல் நீண்டு தோள் என்று வழங்குகின்றது.

7 'தோட்கப் படாத செவி'

8 'கடரோட்டா ரெனின் வேரோர் கட்டுரையும் வேண்டுமோ'

என்பவற்றில் தோள் என்னும் முதனிலை வந்திருப்பது காண்க. தோண்டு என்னுஞ் சொல்லிலும் தோள் என்பதுவே முதனிலையாயுளதன்றே? தொலை என்பதன் முதனிலையாகிய தொள் என்பது தோள் என்று நீண்டதுபோன்று, துலை என்பதன் முதனிலையாகிய துள் என்பது தூள் என்றும் நீளுதல் கூடுமன்றே? தூள் என்பது பு—விசுதி சேர்ந்து தூம்பு என்குகியுளது. தூள் + பு = தூள்பு—தூன்பு—தூம்பு. இனி, காம்பு என்பதில் ளகரம் திரிந்தது போன்று ஈண்டு ளகரம் திரிந்துளது என்னலாம்.

### வங்கு

வங்கு என்பது 9 நரி முதலியவற்றின் வளைக்கு வழங்கும்; வளைவாய் இடம் உடையது என்பது இதன் பொருளாகும். கு—பெயர்ச்-

5. அக. 40

6. சீவக. 232.

7. குமன். 418.

8. சம்ப. குலமுறை. 8.

9. 'குழிநரியின் வங்குக்குள்ளே வழுகி வீழ்வாராம்.' (வள்ளியம்மை கதை)

சொற்களில் பெரும்பாலும் இடப்பொருள் தரும் விசுவயாய் வருகின்றது. பாங்கு, ஆங்கு, மேற்கு, கிழக்கு முதலியன காண்க. வளை என்னுஞ் சொல்லின் முதனிலையாகிய வள் என்பதனோடு கு—சேர்ந்து வங்கு என்றாகியுள்ளது. ஈண்டு ளகரம் ககரத்தின் இனமெல்லெழுத்தாய்த் திரிந்தது எனலாம், பாங்கு என்பதில் ளகரம் ங்கரமாய்த் திரிந்துளது போல.

வாங்கு

\* வாங்கு என்னுஞ் சொல் வளை(த்தல்) என்னும் பொருளில் வழங்கப்பட்டுளது.

10 'பெருங்களிறு வாங்க முரிந்துநிலம் படாஅ  
நாருடை யொசியல்'

என்பது காண்க. இதனால், வாங்கு என்பது வளை என்பதன் முதனிலையாகிய வள் என்பதனது நெடியவடிவில்—அஃதாவது, வாள் என்பதில்நின்று அமைந்ததாகும் எனப் புலனாதல் கூடும். வாள் + கு = வாளுக்கு—வாங்கு. பாங்கு என்னுஞ் சொல்லை ஈண்டு ஒப்பிடலாம். மேற்காட்டிய சில சொற்களால் வள் என்பதன் நெடியவடிவினின்றிஞ் சொற்கள் அமைதல் கூடும் என்பது அறியலாகும்.

மேற்கூறியவற்றால், ளகாரம் கெடுதலும், தன் முன்னின்ற வல் லெழுத்தின் இனமெல்லெழுத்தாய்த் திரிதலும் உண்டென்பது அறியப்படும். நிற்க.

இனி, மெல்லெழுத்துக்களின் திரிபினை நோக்குவோம் :

மெல்லெழுத்துக்களுள் மகாரமொன்றே தன் முன்வரும் வல் லெழுத்துக்களுக்கு கொத்த மெல்லெழுத்தாய்த் திரியும் என்று இலக்கணநூல்கள் கூறும். ஆயின், தொகைச்சொற்களை நோக்கின், னகார நகாரமும் அவ்வாறு திரிதல் உண்டு என்பது புலனாகும்.

வடுகன் + கண்ணன் = வடுகங் கண்ணன்

„ + சாத்தன் = வடுகஞ் சாத்தன்

„ + தேவன் = வடுகந் தேவன்

„ + பூதன் = வடுகம் பூதன்

இவ் வுதாரணங்களில், வடுகன் என்பதிலுள்ள னகரம் முன் வந்த வல்லெழுத்துக்களுக்கு ஒத்த மெல்லெழுத்தாகத் திரிந்துளது காண்க. நன்னூலார் இத்தகைய சொற்களில் ஈற்று நகரம் கெட வந்த வல்லெழுத்திற்கு இனமாகிய மெல்லெழுத்துத் தோன்றும் என்று கொண்டு,

\* வாங்குதல் என்பது இக்காலத்தில் பெறுதல், கொள்ளுதல் இப்பொருளில் பயின்று வழங்குகின்றது.

10. குறுங். 112.

11 'மெல்லொற்று வரினே பெயர்த்தொகை யாகும்'

என்று விதி கூறினார். வடுகனாகிய கண்ணன், வடுகனாகிய சாத்தன் என்னுந் தொடக்கத்துப் பொருள் தருதலின், வடுகன் கண்ணன், வடுகன் சாத்தன் என்னுந் தொடக்கத்தனவே வடுகங் கண்ணன் வடுகஞ் சாத்தன் என்னுந் தொடக்கத்தனவாய் மருவியுள்ளன என்பது உண்மையாதல் எளிதிற் புலனாகும். ஆசிரியர் தொல்காப்பியனார்,

12 'இயற்பெயர் முன்னர்த் தந்தை முறைவரின்  
முதற்கண் மெய்கெட அகரம் நிலையும்  
மெய்யொழித் தன்கெடும் அவ்வியற் பெயரே'

என்று விதி கூறினாராகலின், சாத்தன் என்பது 'அன்' கெட்டுச் 'சாதத்' என்று நிற்க, தந்தை என்பது முதலிலுள்ள தகரமெய் கெட்டு 'அந்தை' என்று அமைய, சாத்த் + அந்தை = சாத்தந்தை என்றாயின என்று கொள்கின்றோம். சாத்தந்தை என்னுந் தொகைச் சொல்லை நோக்கி ஆசிரியர் இவ்வாறு விதிக்கிறாராவர். சாத்தந்தை என்பது சாத்தந்தை என்பதன் மூலம். தை என்பது முறைப்பெயர் விசுவாமிதரன் என்பார் இக்காலத்தார். சாத்தன் + து + ஐ என்ப பிரித்துச் சாத்தனுக்குத் தந்தை என்று பொருள் கூறுதல் தகும் எனத் தோன்றுகின்றது. எவ்வாறாயினும், சாத்தந்தை என்பதுவே சாத்தந்தை என்றாயிற்று என்றல் இயல்பும் அமைதியு மாதற்கு இழுக்கின்றது. இனி, தேன் என்னுஞ் சொல்லை நோக்குவோம்.

தேன் என்னுஞ் சொல், வல்லெழுத்து வருவழி இயல்பாயிருத்தலேயன்றி, னகாரம் திரிதலும் கெடுதலும், கெட்டவழி வல்லெழுத்து மிகுதலும் மெல்லெழுத்து மிகுதலும் உண்டென்பது,<sup>13</sup> 'தேனென்கிளவி', <sup>14</sup> 'மெல்லெழுத்து', என்னுஞ் சூத்திரங்களாற் போதரும். அஃதாவது,

தேன் + குடம் = தேன்குடம், தேற்குடம், தேக்குடம், தேங்குடம்

என்று வரும் என்பதாம். இவற்றுள் தேங்குடம் என்பது தேன்குடம் என்பதன் திரிபே. தேக்குடம் என்பது தேற்குடம் என்பதன் திரிபு. இவ்வாறே அழக்குடம் என்பது அழன்குடம் என்பதன் திரிபாதல் அறிக. நக—க்க ஆதல் பல சொற்களிற் காணலாம். மேற்கு—மேக்கு.

15 'மேக்கு மேற்றிசை மேலும் பேர்'

என்பது நிகண்டு. நிற்கமாட்டான் என்பது நிக்கமாட்டான் என்று வழங்குதல் அறியத்தக்கது. மேற்காட்டியவற்றால், னகாரம் பிறமெல்லெழுத்தாய்த் திரியும் என்பது நன்கு பெறப்படும்.

11. நன். பொது. 20.  
13. " " 45.  
15. ஞடாமணி நி. ககர. 9.

12. தொல். புள்ளிம. 52.  
14. " " 46.

அன்றியும், கண் என்னும் ஏழனுருபு வந்தவழி நிலைமொழி யொற்றுத் திரிந்ததற்கு உதாரணமாக, ஆங்கண் ஈங்கண் என்பவற்றை உரையாசிரியர் காட்டியிருத்தலின், ஆன் ஈன் என்னும் நிலைமொழியின் னகரம் நகரமாப்த் திரிந்தது பெறப்படுமன்றே? இவ்வாறே நஞ்சை புஞ்சை, 'ந்து உடந்தை, உடர்பாடு மேம்பாடு என்பவற்றில் னகரம் முறையே ஞகர, நகர, மகரங்களாய்த் திரிந்துளது காணலாகும்.

இனி நகாரத்தினை நோக்குவோம் :

‘வெரிந்’ என்னுஞ் சொல்லிலுள்ள நகாரம் வல்லெழுத்துக்கள் வரும்-வழி அவற்றின் மெல்லெழுத்துக்களாய்த் திரியும் என்பது ஆசிரியர் தொல்காப்பியனார் கூறியுள்ள விநியினின்று உய்த்துணரப்படும். யாங்களும் எனின்,

16 ‘வெரிநெ னிறதி முழுதுங் கெடுவழி

வருமிட னுடைத்தே மெல்லெழுத் தியற்கை’

என்பதனான், வெரிந் என்பதன் நகரம் கெடும் என்றும், ஆண்டு, வந்த வல்லெழுத்துக்கு ஒத்த மெல்லெழுத்து மிகும் என்றும் ஆசிரியர் விகி கூறியுள்ளார். ஆயின், நகரம் வரும் வல்லெழுத்திற் கேற்பத் திரிந் துளது என்பதுவே அமைதி. ஆகவே,

வெரிந் + குறை = வெரிங்குறை

வெரிந் + புறம் = வெரிம்புறம்

என, நகரமும் ஏனைமெல்லெழுத்துக்களாய்த் திரியும் என்பது அறியப்படுமன்றே?

ஆசிரியர் தொல்காப்பியனார் ‘தும்’ என்பதன் மகரம் கெட, ஆண்டு வரும் வல்லெழுத்திற்கு ஒத்த மெல்லெழுத்துத் தோன்றும் என்றார். நன்னூலார் அம் மகரம் திரியும் என்றார். அவர் கூறியதுவே இயற்கையாதல் எனினின் அறியப்படும். அவ்வாறே வெரிந் என்பதிலும் நகரமெய் திரிந்ததென்று கோடலே அமைதியும் இயல்பும் ஆகும்.

இனி, னகார மெய்யின் திரிபினை நோக்குவோம் :

னகாரமும் மகாரமேபோன்று வரும் வல்லெழுத்துக்கட்கு ஒத்த மெல்லெழுத்துக்களாய்த் திரியும் என்பது அறியப்படுகின்றது. திருத்தண்கால் என்னும் ஊர்ப்பெயர் திருத்தங்கால் என்று செய்யுளிலும் வழக்கிலும் வழங்குதல் உளது.

17 ‘பேராணைக் குறுங்குடியெம் பெருமானைத் திருத்தண்கா

வூராணைக் கரம்பனா ருத்தமனை’

என்னும் பெரியதிருமொழிப் பாசரத்தில் திருத்தண்கால் என்பது காண்கின்றது.

16. தொல். புள்ளிம. 5.

17. பெரியதிருமொழி. 5. 6 : 2.

18 'திருத்தண்கா ஸாரான் திருத்தண் மோயின்  
மருத்தண்கா ஸாராதோ வந்து'

என்னும் அடிகளில் எதுகைத்தொடையில் திருத்தண்கால் என்பது வலியுறுமாறு அமைத்துள்ளார் திவ்யகவி, பின்னைப்பெருமானையங்கார். இவ்வாறாகவும், சிலப்பதிகாரத்தில்,

19 'செங்கோற் றென்னன் திருந்துதொழின் மறையவர்  
தங்கால் என்ப தூரே'

என்று, தங்கால் என்பது எதுகையிற் காண்கின்றது. சங்கப்புலவர் பெயர்களுள் 20 'தங்கால் ஆத்திரேயன் செங்கண்ணனார்', 21 'தங்கால் பொற்கொல்லன் வெண்ணுகனார்' என்னும் பெயர்கள் காண்கின்றன. இவற்றால், தங்கால் என்று வழங்கியிருப்பது அறியலாகும். சிலப்பதிகாரத்தில் தங்கால் என்று வழங்கியிருத்தலின், அதுவே இயல்பாய சொல் எனின், தங்கால் என்பதற்குப் பொருட்சிறப்பு இன்மையானும், தண்கால் என்பதற்கு உண்மையானும் தண்கால் என்பதுவே இயல்பாய பெயர் என்பது நன்கு அறியப்படும். உலகவழக்கில் தண்கால் என்பது தங்கால் என்று வழங்குதல் இயல்பாகலின், அவ்வாறு தாங் கேட்டதனை இளங்கோவடிகள் வழங்கினாராவர். இக்கூறியவற்றால் ணகாரம் றகாரமாய்த் திரிதல் உண்டென அறியலாகும்.

மனைவி என்னும் பொருளில் பெஞ்சாதி என்று வழங்கும் மருஉ-மொழியினால் ணகாரம் ஞகாரமாய்த் திரிதல் அறியப்படும்.

சம்பு

இனி, சம்பு என்னுஞ் சொல்லை நோக்குவோம். நல்வழிச் செய்யுளுள், 'நன்றென்றுந் தீதென்றும்' என்னுஞ் செய்யுளில்,

22 'சம்புறுந்தார் யாக்கைக்குப் போனவா தேடும் பொருள்'

என்னும் பகுதியில் சம்பு என்னுஞ் சொல் ஒருவகைக்கோரை என்னும் பொருளில் வந்திருத்தலை அனைவரும் அறிகுவர். மதுரைக் காஞ்சியில்,

23 'கனிற்றுமாய் செருந்தியொடு கண்பமன் றூர்தர'

என்னும் அடிக்கு ஆசிரியர் நச்சினர்க்கினியர், 'யானை நின்றால் மறையும் வாட்கோரையுடனே சண்பங்கோரையும் நெருங்கி வளர' என்று

18. துற்றெட்டுத்திருப்பதியந்தாதி. 19. சிலப்பதி. 23 74, 5.  
20. நற்றிணை. 386. 21. " 313.  
22. சல்வழி. 23. மதுரைக்காஞ்சி. 172.

பொருள் எழுதியிருக்கின்றார். இதனால், கண்பு என்பதுவே சண்பு என்றும் வழங்கிற்று என அறியலாகும். இனி,

24 'பொன்காண் கட்டளை கடுப்பக் கண்பின்'

என்னும் அடியிலுள்ள 'கண்பின்' என்பதற்குச் 'சண்பின்' என்னும் பாடாந்தரம் குறிக்கப்பட்டுள்ளது. இதனால், சண்பு என்பது கண்பு என்பதன் திரிபு எனல் போதரும். இவ்வாறு சண்பு என்று வழங்கியதுவே பின்னர், சம்பு என மருவியது என்பது தெளிவாகும். ஆகவே, ணகாரம் மகாரமாய்த் திரியும் என்பது அறியலாகும். இனி, ஆம்பிள்ளை பெம்பிள்ளை என்று மருஉவாய் வழங்குந் தொகைச் சொற்களாலும் இத்திரிபு வலியுறும். இன்னுஞ் சில சொற்களை நோக்குவோம்.

### வீம்பு

வீம்பு என்பது வீண்தன்மை என்னும் பொருளில் முதற்கண் வழங்கி, பின்னர், செருக்கு முதலிய பொருளில் வழங்கியதாகும். இதனை நோக்குமபோது, இது, வீண் என்னுஞ் சொல்லோடு பு—விசுதி சேர்ந்து அமைந்ததாகும் எனத் தோன்றுகின்றது. சண்பு—சம்பு என்று மருவியது போன்று வீண்பு—வீம்பு என்று மருவியது. இச்சொல் (வீம்பு) பழைய நூல்களில் வழங்கப்பட்டிலது.

### தெம்பு

தெம்பு என்பது உடல்வன்மை என்னும் பொருளில் வழங்குகின்றது. அச்சொல்லோடு பு—விசுதி நீங்கின், தெம் என்பது எஞ்சி நிற்கும். அதற்குப் பொருளில்லை. தெம்பு என்பதன் பொருளை நோக்கின், அது, திண்பு என்பதன் மருஉ என்பது புலனாகின்றது. திண்பு—தெண்பு என்றாகலு எளிது. இகர எகரங்கள் தம்முண் மாறுதல் பெருவழக்கன்றே? தெண்பு என்பதில் ணகாரம் விசுதியாய் வந்த பகரத்துக்கு இனமாகிய மகரமாய்த் திரிந்துள்ளது.

இதுகாறும் கூறியவற்றால், ணகாரமும் றகாரம் முதலிய மெல்லெழுத்துக்களாய்த் திரிதல் உண்டென்பது நன்கறியப்படும்.

இனி வல்லெழுத்துக்களை நோக்குவோம் :

வல்லெழுத்துக்களுள் ட, ற இவ் விரண்டுமெய்களே பிறமெய்களோடு மயங்குமாகலின் அவ்வாறு மயங்கியவை பின்னர் எவ்வாறு திரிகின்றன என்பதைச் சிறிது நோக்குவோம் : சொற்களில் பிறமெய்களோடு மயங்கியிருக்கும் ட றக்கள் பெரும்பாலும் வேரோரெழுத்தின் திரிபேயாகும். உதாரணமாக—வெட்கம் என்பதில் டகரம் ளகரத்தின் திரிபு; கற்பு என்பதில் றகரம் ளகரத்தின் திரிபு. காட்சி என்



பதில் டகரம் ணகரத்தின் திரிபு; அற்பு என்பதில் றகரம் ணகரத்தின் திரிபு. ஊட்டி, தீற்றி என்பவற்றில் ட ற மெய்கள் முறையே ணகர ணகரங்களின் திரிபு; மீட்டு, வெற்றி என்பவற்றில் ட ற மெய்கள் முறையே ளகர ளகரங்களின் திரிபு. இவற்றால் ட றக்கள் உடனிலையக்கமாயுள்ள சொற்களிலும் அவ்வெழுத்துக்கள் பிற வெழுத்துக்களின் திரிபாயிருத்தல் அறியலாகும்.

### பச்சேரி

பச்சேரி என்பது பள்ளிருக்குஞ் சேரிக்குப் பெயராய் வழங்குகின்றது. இதனை நோக்கின், இது பட்சேரி என்பதன் திரிபு என்பது எளிதிற் போதரும். பள்ளிருப்பிடத்தைப் பட்சேரி என்பது மாபு.

25 'முத்திர வந்ததிரு முக்கூடல் மாலழகர்  
பத்திமற வாதபண்ணைப் பட்சேரிப் பள்ளரொலாம்'

என்று முக்கூடற்பள்ளில் வந்திருப்பது காண்க. இதனால் டகாரம் தன் முன்னிற்கும் எழுத்தாய்த் திரிதல் அறியப்படும். வெக்கம் நுப்பம் (நுட்பம்) என்பனவாய் வழங்குவன சில உள. இனி, றகரத்தை நோக்குவோம் :

### நிப்பாட்டு

நிப்பாட்டு என்பது நிறுத்து என்னும் பொருளில் வழங்குகின்றது. ஆகலின் இது, நிப்பாட்டு என்பதன் திரிபு என எளிதிற் புலனாகும். ஈண்டு ளகரத்தின் திரிபாகிய றகரம் முன்னின்ற பகரமாய்த் திரிந்துளது.

### கொல்லத்துக்காரன்

வீடு முதலியன கட்டுந் தொழிலாளியைத் தென்னாட்டில் கொற்றன் என்றும் வடநாட்டில் கொல்லத்துக்காரன் என்றும் வழங்குகின்றனர். அவன், சுண்ணம் முதலிய சாந்தினை எடுக்கும் கருவியைத் தென்னாட்டில் கரண்டி என்றும் வடநாட்டில் கொல்லறு என்றும் சொல்கின்றனர். கொல்லத்துக்காரன் என்பது கொல்லறு உடையவன், கொல்லறுவினால் தொழில் செய்பவன் என்னும் பொருளதாகும். ஆயின், கொல்லறு என்பதனோடு து—வ்வும் காரன் என்னுஞ் சொல்லும் சேர்ந்து, கொல்லத்துக்காரன் (கொல்லறு + து + காரன் = கொல்லத்துக்காரன் = கொல்லத்துக்காரன்) என்றாகியிருக்கலாம். து—உடைமைப் பொருளைக் குறிப்பது. கொல்லறு என்பதில் உள்ள ற—உகரம்கெட றகரமெய்யாகி, முன்னின்ற தகரமாகியுளது.

சொற்களின் இடை நின்ற உயிர்மெய்யெழுத்துக்களில் உயிர் ஒலிகுறைந்து கெடுதலும், கெட்டவழி நின்ற மெய், தன் முன்னின்ற மெய்க்கேற்பத் திரிதலும் உண்டு. அவ்வாறு திரிந்தன சிலவற்றை ஈண்டு நோக்குவோம்.

### குச்சில்

குச்சில் என்பது மிகச்சிறிதாகிய வீட்டைக்குறித்து வழங்குகின்றது. இப்பொருளில் குடிசை என்னுஞ் சொல்லும் வழங்கும். குச்சில் என்பது குடிசில் என்னுஞ் சொல்லின் மருஉ எனத் தெரிகின்றது. குடிசில் என்பதில் டகரத்தின்பேரின் இகரம் நன்கு ஒலிக்காமற் கெட, குட்சில் என்றாகும். அதுவே குச்சில் என்று மருவியுளது. இது, பச்சேரி என்பதனோடு ஒப்பிடத்தக்கது.

### சொள்ளமாடன்

தென்னாட்டில் பெரும்பாலும் எல்லாஜர்களிலும் காளிகோயில், சுடலைமாதன்கோயில்,<sup>26</sup> இயக்கிகோயில் இவை காணப்படும். சுடலை மாதன் என்பது சொள்ளமாதன் என்று வழங்குகின்றது. சொள்ள மாதன், சொள்ளமுத்து என்று மக்கட்குப் பெயரிடுதல் உண்டு. சுடலைமாதன் என்பது சொடலைமாதன் எனத் திரிதல் எளிது. உகர ஒகரங்கள் தம்முள் திரிதல் பெருவழக்கன்றே? மொழியிடை ஐகாரம் ஒருமாத்திரையா யொலிப்பதனால் சொடலைமாதன் என்பது சொடலமாதன் என்றே ஒலிக்கப்படும். இதில், டகரத்தின்மேல் ஊர்ந்து நின்ற அகரம் நன் கொலிக்காமல் கெட, சொடலமாதன் என்றாகும். அதுவே சொள்ளமாதன் என்றாகியுளது. டகரத்தால் லகாரம் ளகாரமாயிற்று. தெலுங்கில் இவ்வாறுதல் உண்டு. தெலுங்கில்<sup>27</sup> த்ராடு என்னும் ஒருமைச்சொல்லோடு பன்மை விகுதியாகிய 'லு' சேர, த்ராடுலு எனப் பன்மைச்சொல் அமையும். அது, த்ராட்லு என்றும் த்ராள்ளு என்றும் வழங்கும். ஆந்திர ஸ்பத்த சிந்தாமணியில் உள்ள,

28 'டலடா முதிதாம் தஸ்ய ச வா லுக்'

என்னுஞ் குத்திரத்தாலும், அதனுரையில்,

த்ராடு—த்ராள்ளு

தடி —தள்ளு

என்று காட்டியிருக்கும் உதாரணத்தானும் இஃது அறியப்படும்.

26. இசுக்கி என்று வழங்கும்.

27. இது சரடு என்று தமிழில் வழங்குகின்றது. இதை நோக்கின், தரடு என்பதுவே சரடு எனத் திரிந்துளது என்பது புலனாகும். சகரமுதன் மொழி பண்டு இன்மையின்.

28. ஆந்திர ஸ்பத்த சிந்தாமணி அஜந்தபரிச். 75.

குள்ளன்

குள்ளன் என்பது வடிவிற குறியவனுக்குப் பெயராய் வழங்குகின்றது. இதனை நோக்குமிடத்து, குறளன் என்பது இவ்வாறு மருவியுளது எனத் தோன்றுகின்றது. குறளன் என்பதில் நகரம் ஊர்ந்த அகரம் நன் கொலிக்காமற் கெட, குறளன் என்றாகி, அதுவே குள்ளன் என்றாகியுளது. தெலுங்கில் இவ்வாறுதல் உண்டு.

தெலுங்கில் ஏறு (யாறு) என்னும் ஒருமைச்சொல்லோடு பன்மை விசுதியாகிய 'லு' என்பது சேர, ஏறுலு என்றாகும். ஏறு என்பதன் உகரம் கெட, ஏர்ளு என்றும் ஏள்ளு என்றும் வழங்குகின்றது. இவ்வாறே ஊருலு என்பதும் ஊர்ளு, ஊன்ளு என்று வழங்கும். இது,

29 'ரோ ல :'

என்னுஞ் சூத்திரத்தானும், அதனுரையில்,

ஏறு — ஏள்ளு

கோரு—கோள்ளு [உகர்கள்]

என்று காட்டியிருக்கும் உதாரணத்தானும் அறியலாகும். இனி, தெலுங்கில் மறலி என்பது மல்ஷி என்று வழங்குதலை நோக்கின், குறளன் என்பது குள்ளன் என்று வழங்குதல் கூடும் என்பது நன்கு அறியப்படும். இவ்வாறே, சொற்களில் இடைநின்ற உயிர் நன் கொலிக்காமற் கெட்டவழி நின்ற மெய், தனக்கு முன்னிற்கும் மெல்லெழுத்தாய்த் திரிதலும் உண்டு.

மதனி என்னுஞ் சொல் பார்ப்பனவழக்கில் மன்னி என்று வழங்குகின்றது. அதனை நோக்கின், அச்சொல்லில் தகரமூர்ந்து நின்ற அகரம் கெட மதனி என்றாகி, அதுவே மன்னி என்று திரிந்துளது என்பது நன்கறியலாகும். வடமொழியில் பத்ரி என்று வழங்குஞ் சொல், தமிழில் 'பன்னி' என்று வழங்குதல் ஈண்டு ஒப்பிடற்பாலது.

இதுகாறும் சொற்களில் இயல்பாயமைந்த மெய்யெழுத்துக்களின் திரிபினுள்ளும், தன்மை யூர்ந்து நின்ற உயிர்கெட்டவழி அம் மெய்யெழுத்துக்கள் திரியுந் திரிபினுள்ளும், சொற்களின் முதனிலை காண்டற்கு வேண்டுந் துணை சில ஆராயப்பட்டன. உயிர்மெய்யெழுத்துக்கள் சொற்களின் மூன்றிடத்தும் பலவகையில் திரிதல் உண்டு. அவற்றைப் பிறிதொரு கட்டுரையில் நோக்குவோம்.

# INFLEXION IN DRAVIDIAN LANGUAGES

By

K. RAMAKRISHNAYYA, M.A.,

*Head of the Telugu Department, University of Madras.*

This is an attempt to trace the development of inflexion in the major languages of the Dravidian group, particularly with reference to Telugu. The origin and the significance of 'Vibhakti' in Sanskrit is explained and it is argued that this idea of Vibhakti cannot be applied in the case of the Dravidian group of languages, though for the sake of convenience it is generally adopted therein. The so-called case-signs are traced to independent words in the language, and the relation between the base and the post-positions is explained as one of attributive nature. The inflexional increments, i.e. the 'aupavibhaktikaṣ', are also independent words introduced only to make the possessive idea clear. This principle holds good even in the case of verbal inflexion, as the verbal form in these languages, is mostly composed of a verbal participle or adjective qualifying a pronoun standing after it. Thus even the idea of 'ting-vibhakti' has no application here. It therefore becomes clear that the sentence structure in the Dravidian Languages depends mostly on the idea of attributive relationship of words forming the sentence, and this is an indication that these languages have not yet passed the stage of agglutination.



# INFLEXION IN DRAVIDIAN LANGUAGES

By

K. RAMAKRISHNAYYA, M.A.,

Head of the Telugu Department.

ద్రావిడ భాషలు.

విభక్తి.

ద్రావిడభాషలలో విభక్తిస్వరూపపరిణామము రెట్టివో పరికింపదలచినచో, 'విభక్తి' యనగా నేమో ముందు తెలిసికొనవలసియుండును. 'విభక్తి' అనగా విభజనము, విభాగము అని శబ్దార్థము. దేని యొక్క 'విభాగము' ? అని తరువాత ప్రశ్న. ఈ 'విభక్తి' అనునది భాషకు సంబంధించినదగుటచే భాషయొక్క విభాగమని చెప్పవలసియున్నది. భాష అనంతమైనది. దాని ననేకరీతుల విభజింపవచ్చునుగదా. 'నామము, అభ్యుత, ఉపసర్గ, నిపాత' అను ఒకవిధమైన విభాగము ప్రాచీన హైందవవైయాకరణులచే జేయబడినది. వీనిని వారు పదజాతమున్నారు. ఈ పదజాతమెట్లువచ్చినదని విచారింపగా, అనంతమైన భాషకు ఒకవిధమైన పరిమాణము, లేదా కొలతబద్ధయని చెప్పదగిన 'వాక్యము' అను దానిని విభాగింపగా నేర్పడి నట్లగపడుచున్నది. వాక్య మనునది భాషలో సంపూర్ణభావోధకమగు కొన్ని శబ్దముల సమూహము. భాషము లనంతములు, అట్లే వానిని వ్యక్తముచేయు భాషయు ననంతమే యని చెప్పవచ్చును. కాని మానవుడితరులకు వ్యక్తపరచదలచిన యొక సంపూర్ణభావ మొకవాక్యమున నిమిడియుండకతప్పదు. కావుననే యొక్క సంపూర్ణభాషమును వ్యక్తపరచగల వాక్యమునే భాషకొకవిధమైన పరిమాణము (unit) గా గ్రహింపవలసివచ్చినది. సంపూర్ణభావభోధకమగు నీ వాక్యము యొక్క స్వరూపము, మానవుని వ్యవహారమున ననేకవిధములు గలదై యుండవచ్చును. ఆదిమానవుల సంఘమెట్లుండెనో వారి భాషాస్వరూపమెట్టిదో యను విషయము కేవల మూహామాత్రగోచరమేయైనను, ఆ యాదికాలమున మానవుడు వ్యక్తధ్వని రూపమగు భాషమూలమున కంటెనూ, ముఖవికారాలుచేతనూ, హస్తాద్యవయవ సంజ్ఞల మూలమునను విశేషముగా తన భాషముల నితరులకు వ్యక్తముచేసియుండునని మనము తలంపవచ్చును. ధ్వనిరూపమగు భాష అల్పమై ఏకాక్షర ద్వ్యక్షర ధాతురూపముగనుండి భిన్నస్వర సమ్మేళనముచే నర్థభేదమును సూచించునదైయుండి యుండును. ఆయా భావభేదములను వ్యక్తపఱచుటకు సంజ్ఞలను విశేషముగా దోడ్పడియుండవచ్చును. మానవుని సాంఘి

కానశ్శకతలు, భావసంపద, పెంపొందినకొలది, ఆయాధాతువుల సమ్మేళనము మూలముగాను, అనుకరణము మూలముగాను, ఆతని భాషయు వృద్ధినొందుచుండును. ఒకప్పుడు భిన్నస్వర (intonation) సమ్మేళనముచే నొక్కొక్క ధాతువుచే నూచింపబడిన సంపూర్ణభావమునందలి భిన్నచ్ఛాయలు వ్యక్తముచేయబడుట తటస్థించినను, ఆ ధాతు తెట్టిమార్పునుబొందక సంపూర్ణ భావబోధకమై యట్లే చిరకాలమొక్కొక భాషలో నిలిచి యుండవచ్చును. దీనికి చీనాదేశపువారి భాషయే నిదర్శనము. ఇట్టి భాషను ధాతురూప భాష (Radical or Isolative Language) అని అందురు.

భాషల వర్గీకరణము—ప్రత్యయాల భాషలు.

భావభేదమును నూచించుట కాధాతురూపములో గొన్ని మార్పులుచేసియో లేదా ఒక ధాతువుపై తత్తదర్థమును నూచింపగల మతీయకదానింజేర్చియో చెప్పట మరియొక పద్ధతి. ఈ తుదిపద్ధతి నవలంబించి వృద్ధినొందిన భాషలను సంయుక్త ధాతురూప భాషలు (Agglutinative languages) అని చెప్పదురు. కాని ఈ ధాతు సంయోగములో మరియొక విశేషముకూడకలదు. భిన్నధాతు సంయోగము కలిగినపుడు వాని సహజస్వరూపమే మారిపోయి అవి 'ప్రత్యేకముగా గుర్తుపట్టలేనంతటి స్థితిని బొందుటయు గలుగవచ్చును; లేదా, ఒకదానిపై నొకటి చేరుటచే మూలధాతువుయొక్క యర్థము సంపూర్ణముగా మార్పునొందిననుగూడ, వీని స్వరూపము మాత్రము విశేషము మార్పునొందక, మూలరూపములను దలపించుచునే యుండవచ్చును. భిన్నధాతు సంయోగమున వాని సహజస్వరూపము గుర్తింపబడజాలని స్థితి యేర్పడినప్పుడు అందఱ శబ్దమైయున్న భాగము ఏదో ఒక ప్రత్యేకార్థమును నూచించుటకుగా జేర్చబడిన "ప్రత్యయము"గా గ్రహింపబడుట తటస్థించును. ఈ కారణముచే నిట్టిభాషలు 'ప్రత్యయాల భాషలు'ని (Inflectional Languages) చెప్పబడుచున్నవి. ఈ ప్రత్యయమును దానికి స్వతంత్రమైన యొక యర్థముండదు. ఇది యే ధాతువునుండి, లేదా యే శబ్దము నుండి యెట్లు నిష్పన్నమైనదో, అది నూచించునాయా యర్థమునకదియెట్లు నూచకంబగుట తటస్థించినదో చెప్పుటకవకాశముండదు. అనగా నవి తత్తదర్థవ్యక్తార్థాద్యర్థక ప్రత్యయకములు, లేదా ద్యోతకములు మాత్రమే గాని, తదర్థబోధక విషయమున "శక్తము"లు కావు. ఆర్యభాషలనబడు ఇండోయూరపీయక్ కుటుంబమునకు జెందిన భాషలలో "విభక్తి ప్రత్యయము"లనబడు వీని కిట్టి స్థితి యెప్పుడుకలిగినదో తెలిసికొనుట కవకాశము కలుగుట లేదు. అనగా నీప్రత్యయము లనబడునవి యే స్వతంత్రపదములయొక్క మూలరూపములలో లేదా అవశిష్టభాగములలో అను విషయము ఈ భాషల పూర్వచరిత్ర వెంతవర కన్వేషించినను తెలియవచ్చుట లేదన్నమాట. ఈ కుటుంబములోని ప్రాచీనకాళులకుజెందిన సంస్కృతము, గ్రీకు, లాటిన్, గాథిక్ మొదలగు భాషలను వాని చరిత్రను ఎంతవరకు పరిశీలించినను, ఆ ప్రత్యయములనబడునవి ప్రత్యయములుగానే కనబడుచున్నవి. ఈ భాష

లన్నిటికి మూలమగు ప్రాచీన ఇండోయూరపియన్ భాషయే ప్రత్యయాంతత్వస్థితినిబెందిన భాషగాకనబడుచున్నదని తద్భాషాంతత్వపరిశీలకుల యభిప్రాయమైయున్నది. కాని భాషల సహజపరిణామరీతులనుబట్టి విచారించినచో, నీ ప్రత్యయములనబడునవి యేదోయొక కాలముందైనను సంపూర్ణాభివృద్ధి కమలైన ధాతువుల, లేదా శబ్దముల పరిణతరూపములేయని తలంచుట సమంజసమగుటచేత, ప్రస్తుతము ప్రత్యయాంత భాషగా గనబడుచున్న ప్రాచీన ఇండో యూరపియన్ భాషకూడ ననేకపరిణామములనుబొందియే యాస్థితికి వచ్చినదని తలంపవలసియున్నది.

ఇట్లు హిందూదేశమునకు పశ్చిమపు దిక్కుగానున్న ఇండో యూరపియన్ భాష లన్నియు ప్రత్యయాంతత్వస్థితిని బొందియుండగా, నీదేశమునకు తూర్పువైపున ఆసియా ఉత్తర మధ్యభాగములలోనున్న భాషలు, దక్షిణ హిందూదేశ భాషలవలెనే ప్రత్యయాంతత్వస్థితినిబొందక చాలవరకు సంయుక్తపదరూపత్వ స్థితినే వహించియున్నవి. ఈ సంయుక్తపద రూపత్వమనునది భాషాపరిణామమున ధాతురూప స్థితికిని, ప్రత్యయాంత స్థితికిని ఒకవిధమైన మధ్యస్థితియని చెప్పవచ్చును. దక్షిణ హిందూదేశ భాషలీ మధ్యస్థితినే వహించియున్నను, క్రమముగ ప్రత్యయాంత స్థితివైపునకు దారితీయుచున్నట్లున్నది. దీనికి సంపూర్ణముగా ప్రత్యయాంత భాషయగు సంస్కృతము తోడి చిరసాహచర్యముకూడ కొంతప్రోద్బలకమగుచున్నది. అయినను ఈ భాషల ప్రాచీన చరిత్రమును పరిణామమును బరిశీలించినప్పు డివి చిరకాలమునుండి సంయుక్త పదరూపస్థితియందే యున్న వనుభావము వ్యక్తము కాకమానదు.

భాషా వ్యాకరణము—ఆర్యభాషలు.

ఇక 'విభక్తి', లేదా అఖండ వాక్యవిభాగము, అనుదానికి ధాతురూప పదభాషల విషయమున సమన్వయమేమియుగనబడదు గదా. ఇది ప్రధానముగా ప్రత్యయాంత భాష లకుసంబంధించి యేర్పడినదే యనవలసియున్నది. ఇంతేగాక భాషాంతత్వపరిశీలనము, భాషావ్యాకరణము (Linguistic analysis) అనునవికూడ మొట్టమొదట ప్రత్య యాంత భాషలగు నీయార్యభాషలకు సంబంధించినవిగానే బయలుదేరినట్లు కనబడుచున్నది.

భాషను వ్యాకరించుట అనగా సంపూర్ణభాషములను వ్యక్తీకరించెడి భాషయందలి యఖండవాక్యములను గోన్నిటిని దీసికొని వాని నొండొంటిలో భోల్చుచూచి, యా వాక్యములలోనే యే భాగములలోనెట్టి సామ్యము భేదముగలదో, ఏయేభాగములకెంతంత యర్థమో విచారించి, ఆ యఖండవాక్యమును భేదించి, దానిలో నీ యీ ముక్క ఆ భాగములలో నీ యీ ఖండభాషమును నూచించుచున్నదని నిర్ధారణచేయుటయేయై యున్నది. "వ్యాక్రియంతే-వివిచ్య ప్రదర్యంతే అనేన శబ్దాః ఇతి వ్యాకరణం." దీని చేత యఖండ వాక్యమునందలి భాగములగు శబ్దములు విడగొట్టబడి, వాని రూపనిష్పత్తి



క్రమము లేదా వానికి వాక్యమున నితరభాగములతోగల సంబంధము వ్యక్తముగా చూపబడును గావున నిది వ్యాకరణ మనబడుచున్నది అని “వ్యాకరణ” శబ్దము పఠంబలిచే మహాభాష్యమున నిర్వచింపబడినది. అయితే ఈ కాలమున మనవ్యాకరణ కర్తలు చేయునది ఆయా భాషలలోని ఆ యఖండవాక్యములను విడగొట్టి పదములను ఎత్తిచూపి ఈ యా భాగమున కీయగ్ధమనిగాని, వాని లక్షణమిట్టిదియనిగాని నిరూపించుటకాదు. ఈపని యేభాషా విషయములోనైనను ఆ భాషను మాటలాడు జనులు గాని నేకాలమందైతే సవిమర్శంబుగ నభ్యసింపగడంగియుండినో ఆకాలమందలి తత్త్వవేత్తలచేతనే చేయబడియుండును. ఇతిరభాషా సంస్కరము, తత్సంస్కరముచేగలిగిన మార్పులునుగూడ, ఆయా కాలములందు స్వీయభాషా పరిశీలనమునకు వారిని ప్రోత్సహింపగలవు. కావున నేమాత్రమైనను వృద్ధిలోనున్న నాగరక భాషల విషయములో నింతకు బూర్వము చాలకాలము క్రిందటనే అద్భివ్రయాకరణులు, లేదా తత్త్వవేత్తలు ఆయా భాషలలోని యఖండ వాక్యములను విభాగించి వానిలోనిన్నివిధములగు పదములున్నవని యేర్పరచియేయున్నారు వాని లక్షణములు కాలక్రమమున నిశ్చయింపబడి నిరూపింపబడుచువచ్చినవి. ఇట్టి లక్షణములనుబట్టి యే ఇటీవలి భాషా తత్వజ్ఞులకొందరు, ఇప్పటివరకు లక్షణయుక్తములు కాక నిలిచియున్న యనాగర భాషలను గొన్నిటిని గ్రహించి, యందలి యఖండ వాక్యములను క్రొత్తగా భేదించి, వానికి లక్షణమేర్పరుచుచున్నారు. కాని చరిత్ర కంధినంతవఱకు భాషాస్వరూపమునుగూర్చి విచారణచేసి, భాషా వ్యాకరణమునకుగడంగిన వారిలో హిందూదేశీయులు, గ్రీకు దేశీయులును అగ్రగణ్యులుగా గనబడుచున్నారు. క్రీస్తు శకమునకు బూర్వమే గ్రీకు తత్త్వవేత్తలు, తర్కశాస్త్రముయొక్కయు, తత్త్వశాస్త్రముయొక్కయు సహాయముచే ముందు భావమునందు లేదా అర్థమునందు విభాగములు గల్పించుకొని వానిని పిదప శబ్దమునకు - అనగా వాక్యమునకు అన్వయింపజేసినారు. వాక్యమున కర్తయని, క్రియయని భేదము కల్పించినది తత్త్వవేత్తలు. ప్లేటోకాలమునకు నామము, క్రియ అనుభాషా భాగములు మాత్రమేర్పడినవి. ఆరిస్టాటిల్ అను నాతడు, సముచ్చయములనుగూడ నిరూపింప “కెనొడొటన్” కాలమునకు సర్వనామము, ఆరిస్టార్కస్ కాలమునకు ఉపసర్గము భాషా భాగములుగా నేర్పడినట్లున్నవి. ఆరిస్టాటిల్ వచనభేదమును, విభక్తులను నూచించినవాడైనను, వాని కప్పటికింకను సాంకేతిక పదములేర్పడలేదు. క్రియాపదముల యొక్కయు, నామవాచక పదములయొక్కయు విభక్తులలోగల భేదమింకను నిరూపింపబడలేదు. కాని మఱికొంతకాలమునకు హోమరు (Homer) మహాకవి గ్రంథములను సవిమర్శంబుగ జదువుట ప్రారంభమైనకొలదిని గ్రీకుదేశీయులకు, మొదట ప్లేచ్చులని (Barbarians) బాల్కేరియనునని తూలనాడిన యితర దేశీయులతోడి, సంస్కరము పెరిగి వారి భాషల నభ్యసింపవలసిన యావశ్యకత కలిగినకొలదిని భాషాస్వరూపము బాగుగ విమర్శింపబడి, ఆయా భాషాభాగములకుదగిన వ్యాకరణ సంకేతములును కల్పింపబడజొచ్చినవి.

వైదికయుగము—భాషాతత్వ జిజ్ఞాస.

హిందూదేశమున నితకు చాల పూర్వముననే భాషా తత్వజిజ్ఞాస బయలుదేరుట, భాషావిభాగములను గూర్చిన నిశ్చయ జ్ఞాన మలవడుట, వ్యాకరణ సంప్రదాయములేర్పడుట తటస్థించినట్లు తెలియుచున్నది. ఋగ్వేదకాలముననే యీ దేశమున భాషయనునది వ్రాగ్రూపముగు నొక దేవతగా భావింపబడుటయేగాక, ఆ దేవతయొక్క శక్తి స్వరూపములనుగూర్చి యనేక విధములగు స్తోత్రములు చేయబడినవి. ఋగ్వేదము 10 వ మండలము 125 వ సూక్తములో,

“అహమేవ స్వయమిదం వదామి జుష్టం దేవేభి రత మానుషేభిః  
యం కామయే తం త ముగ్రం కృణోమి ।  
తం బ్రాహ్మణం తం ఋషిం తం సుమేధాం  
అహం జనాయ సమదం కృణోమ్యహం ద్యావాపృథివీ ఆవివేశ ” ॥

తానెవరిని ప్రేమించునో వానిని వీర్యవంతునిగను, బ్రహ్మస్వరూపునిగను, ఋషిగను చేయుననియు, భూమ్యాకాశముల నావరించుచుండుననియు నా దేవతచెప్పినట్లు చెప్ప బడియున్నది. ఈ దేవతయే ప్రజాపతికి సహచరియై లోకసృష్టికి కారకురాలగును. సృష్టికర్తగా భావింపబడిన ప్రజాపతికి వాగ్దేవత సహచరిగాను ఆతడు చేయుసృష్టికి కారకురాలుగాను తెలుపబడినది. అనగా, సృష్టిలోని వస్తువులకును వానిని బోధించు శబ్దములకును అవివాభావసంబంధము దీనిచే నూచితమగుచున్నట్లున్నది. దీనినే “సిద్ధి శబ్దార్థ సంబంధ” అను నూత్రమున శబ్దార్థములకు సంబంధము నిత్యమని చెప్పట మాలముగా మహాభాష్య కర్తయగు పఠంజలి వ్యక్తముచేసి నాడు.

“అనాదినిధనం బ్రహ్మ శబ్దతత్వం ప్రచక్షి తే ।  
వివర్త తేషాం భావేన ప్రక్రియా జగతోయతః ॥

అను వైయాకరణ భూషణకారుని శ్లోకముగూడ శబ్దార్థములకుగల సంబంధమునే తెలుపు చున్నది. దీనినిబట్టి శక్తి (energy) స్వరూపముగు శబ్ద(రూప) బ్రహ్మయే అర్థభావమున వివర్తమును బొందుటచే జగత్సృష్టి కలిగినదనుభావము వ్యక్తమగుచుండుటయేగాక శక్తి స్వరూపమునకును (form of energy) అర్థస్వరూపమునకును (form of matter) గల సాహచర్య సంబంధముకూడ నూచింపబడినట్లయినది. కావున నిదియు ఋగ్వేదమున తెలుపబడిన ప్రజాపతీ వాగ్దేవతా సాహచర్యము, సృష్టికారకత్వభావమునే యనునదింపు చున్నట్లున్నది. వైదిక ఋషులు తమహంతరంగిక దృష్టిచే నాధునిక ప్రకృతిశాస్త్ర వేత్తలత్యంత పరిశ్రమచేసి యీ కాలమున కనిపెట్టగలిగిన శక్తి పదార్థములకుగల సంబంధము (relation between matter and energy) వై ఋగ్వేద వాక్యములచే నూచింప

బడినదని యూహింపవచ్చును. అయితే ఈ శబ్దార్థముల సంబంధము నిత్యమేయైనను ఆయా యర్థములయందు తత్తచ్చబ్ధప్రయోగము మాత్రము లోకమువలన జరుగవలసినదే. “లోకతః అర్థప్రయుక్తే శబ్దప్రయోగే” అని భాష్యకారుడు చెప్పియున్నాడు. అనగా లోకమున నొకశబ్ద మొక యర్థమును నూచింపగలుగుట లోకసంకేతమువలననేగాని (convention) స్వభావసిద్ధముగనో లేదా యీశ్వర సంకేతమువలననో మాత్రముకాదనుట. దీనినే ఆధునికశబ్దశాస్త్రజ్ఞులు ‘convention’ అని చెప్పినారు.

బ్రాహ్మణములలో నీవాగ్దేవతను గూర్చిన కథలనేకములుగలవు. ప్రజాపతియే ప్రపంచస్వరూపుడనియు, నాతడు తన సహచరియగు వాక్యము వదలివేయగా నామె యొక మహాప్రవాహమునలె నీ ప్రపంచమునంతను వ్యాపించి ముంచివేసినదనియు పంచవింశ బ్రాహ్మణమున (XX. 14-2) చెప్పబడియున్నది. ఒకప్పుడు మనస్సునకును వాగ్దేవతకును స్పర్థ కలుగగా, మనస్సు “నాకవగాహనకాని విషయమును దేనిని నీవు చెప్పలేవు. నేను దేనిని తలచిన దానినే నీ మనుకరించిచెప్పుదువు. కావున నేనేనీకంటె గొప్పదానను,” అని వాగ్దేవితో జెప్పగా, నామె “నీవేమి తలచినను, నీకేమి తెలియవచ్చినను నామూలముననే తెలియవచ్చుచున్నది. నేనే తెలుపుచున్నాను. కావుననీకంటె నేనేగొప్పదానను” అని ప్రత్యుత్తరమిచ్చెనుట. పిదప వీరిద్దరు ప్రజాపతిని తమతఃపు తీర్పుమనియడుగగా “మనస్సు ననుసరించి దాని భావములనుకరించునదే వాక్కినియు, అనుసరించుదానికంటె ననుసరింపబడునదే గొప్పదిగావున వాక్కుకంటె మనస్సే గొప్పద”ని చెప్పగా వాగ్దేవత అతనిపై గోపించి హవిర్భాగమును దానాతనికి ముట్టజేయని చెప్పినదట. ఆకారణముచేతనే,

\*“శక్తం పదం”

“ఆస్మాత్పదాదయమర్థోబోధవన్య ఇతి ఈశ్వర సంకేతశక్తిః”

అని తార్కికులు—

“We conclude, that the relation between the sound symbol, and the thing symbolized is wholly arbitrary, and that there is no natural or necessary connection between them.

Observe a child in the process of learning its mother tongue. It sees an object say a spoon, and hears a certain sound-complex. This happens repeatedly. Eventually this sound complex will evoke in it a certain mental image corresponding to the physical object. This is a conditional response. A french child would have a different conditioning. It is only as a long and complicated training that a child comes to understand the system of symbols that constitutes its native language, There is nothing natural or instinctive about it.”

—Palmer.

యజ్ఞములందు ప్రజాపతికి హోమముచేయునపుడు ఆ హవిర్దాన మంత్రము మెల్లగా జెప్పబడుచున్నది. అని ఒక కథ శతపథ బ్రాహ్మణమున (1: 5: 81-2) గలదు. దీనిని బట్టి భావము, భావ, అనువాని సంబంధము, పాఠ్యాపర్యము మొదలగువానిని గూర్చిన చర్చ లాకాలముననే జరుగుచున్నట్లు తెలియుచున్నది. భావలేనిదీ భావముకలుగుట సాధ్యముకాదు, వాక్సహాయములేనిదే సంకల్పముపుట్టుటకవకాశములేదు (no thinking without language) అనునట్టి వాదము లిటీవలి కాలమునగూడ బయలుదేరినవేగదా. తైత్తిరీయ బ్రాహ్మణమున వాక్కు- ఇంద్రుని భార్యయనియు ప్రపంచమంతయు నామెలో నిమిడియున్నదనియు, మంత్రేంద్రులగు మహర్షులు, దేవతలునుగూడ నామెను మహా తపస్సుచే సాధింతురనియు చెప్పబడినది. మొదట ఆవ్యాకృతమైయుండిన యీ వాక్కును అనగా భావను తొలుత వ్యాకరించినవాడుకూడ ఇంద్రుడే యొకట్లు శతపథ బ్రాహ్మణము చెప్పుచున్నది,

“ వాన్వై పరాచీ ఆవ్యాకృతా అవదత్తే

తే దేవా ఇంద్రమబ్రువన్ ఇమాం నో వాచం వ్యాకృతుః ।

స మధ్యతోఽవక్రమ్య వ్యాకరోత్

తేన వ్యాకృతా వాగుద్యతా ” ॥

ఈ ఇంద్రుడు దేవేంద్రుడో మఱియొక మానవేంద్రుడో చెప్పటకవకాశము లేదు గాని, ఈ కథవలన నీ భావ యొకకాలమున నవ్యాకృతమైయుండిననియు, తరువాత నింద్రుడను నాతడు దీనిని వ్యాకరించి లక్షణమేర్పరిచెననియు మాత్రము మనకు తెలియ వచ్చుచున్నది. ఈ భావలో పూర్వమొకకాలమున వైంద్రవ్యాకరణముననుసరింపబడిన ప్రసిద్ధియుగలదు. పాణిని వ్యాకరణము బయలుదేరిన పిమ్మట నంతకు బూర్వమునగల వ్యాకరణములతో పాటు ఈ వైంద్రవ్యాకరణముగూడ నశించినదని సోమదేవుని కథా సరితాస్కరమున దెలుపబడిన యొక యైతిహ్యమువలన తెలియుచున్నది.

“ త త్రైకః పాణినిర్నామ జడబుద్ధితరోఽభవత్

స శుశ్రూషా పరికిప్యఃప్రేషితో వర్షభార్యయా

అగచ్ఛత్తేషసే భిన్నః విద్యాకామో హిమాలయం

తత్ర తీవ్రేణ తపసా తోషితా దిందుశేఖరాత్ ।

సర్వవిద్యాముఖం తేన ప్రాప్తం వ్యాకరణం నవం

తతశ్చాగత్య మామేవ వాచాయావ్యయతే స్మ సః

ప్రవృత్తే చావయోర్వాదే ప్రయాతాః సప్త వాసరాః

అన్యమేహ్నిమయాతస్మిక్ జనే తతస్మిన్సర్వం

నభద్రేన మహాఘోరో హుంకార కృంభు నా కృతః

తేన ప్రణవమైంద్రం త దస్మవ్యాకరణం భువ

జతాః పాణినినా సర్వే మూర్ఖీభూతా వయం పునః ” ॥

దీనినిబట్టి కాలిదాసాదులవలెనే మొదట జడమతియైయుండిన పాణిని మహేశ్వరానుగ్రహమువలన నూతనవ్యాకరణమును సంపాదించుటయేగాక ప్రతిపక్షులను వాదమున నోడించి యంతకు బూర్వము వ్యాప్తిలోనున్న ఇంద్రవ్యాకరణము నీలోకమున నకింపజేసిననుగాధ తెలియుచున్నది. పాణిని వ్యాకరణ నూత్రములను రచించి వైదికలాంకికభాషలకనుకాసనమేర్పరచిన తరువాత ఆతని వ్యాకరణఫక్తియే యనుసరింపబడుటచే నితరవ్యాకరణములన్నియు వెనుకబడినవి. అట్లే కొన్ని రూపుమానియుండును.

ఎట్లైనను పాణినికి చిరపూర్వమే, మంత్ర బ్రాహ్మణముల కాలమునుండియు, భాషాతత్వవిమర్శన మీతేశమున జరుగుచు నేయున్నదనియుననేకులు సుప్రసిద్ధ వైయాకరణులు అతనికి బూర్వ ముండిరనియు వనకు తెలియుచున్నది గదా. తొలుత పాతప్రపంచముల మూలముగ నొక సంతతినుండి మఱియొక సంతతికి వచ్చుచుండు వేదమంత్రము లుచ్చారణ భేదమునుబట్టి భిన్నభిన్న శాఖ లగుచుండగా, నట్టిమార్పుల నరికట్టుటకై ఆయాశాఖల యందలి స్వరవర్ణోచ్చారణ రీతులు నిర్ణయింపబడి “ప్రాతిశాఖ్యలను” గ్రంథములు రచింపబడినవి. బ్రాహ్మణములలోనిట్టి స్వరవర్ణోచ్చారణరీతులను దెలుపు భాగమునకు “శీక్షాధ్యాయము”నుబట్టి తెలియుచున్నది. “అథ శీక్షాం వ్యాఖ్యాస్యామః; వర్ణః స్వరః మాత్రా బలం సామసంతానః. ఇత్యుక్తః శీక్షాధ్యాయః” అనికలదు. ఇత్యుక్తే వేదనాయోపదిశ్యంతే స్వరవర్ణాదయః యత్రాసా శీక్షా, సైవ శీక్షా—“ అని శాయనాచార్యులు దీనికి వ్యుత్పత్తి చెప్పినాడు. ఇచ్చట వర్ణములు (letters), స్వరము (accent), మాత్ర (quantity) ప్రాస్వదీర్ఘపుటములు, బలం (organs of pronunciation) వర్ణోత్పత్తి క్రమము; సామ (delivery) ఉచ్చారణ రీతి, సంతానము (euphonic laws) వర్ణములకలయిక అందువలనగలుగు మార్పులు; వీనిని గూర్చి యీ శీక్షాధ్యాయము చెప్పుచున్నది. శుక్ల యజుర్వేద బ్రాహ్మణమునుబట్టి (XIII-51) వచన భేదమును, ఛాందోగ్యోపనిషత్తును బట్టి స్వర్య, స్వర, ఉచ్ఛవర్ణాదిసాంకేతిక నామములు నాకాలమునకు బయలుదేరినట్లు స్పష్టము. ప్రాతిశాఖ్యలనాటికే విభక్తిజ్ఞానమును, విభక్తులు సప్తసంఖ్యాకము లనిగూడ నిశ్చయింపబడినది. యాస్కాచార్యులు “నామాఖ్యాతోప సర్వనిపాతాః” అని భాషా భాగములను బేర్కొనియున్నాడు. దీనినిబట్టి గ్రీకు భాషలోకంపైను ముందే గీర్వాణభాషలో భాషావ్యాకరణ క్రియాకలాపము బయలుదేరినట్లును ఇంతకు నతిప్రాచీనకాలమున నింద్రుడే తొలుతనీ భాషలోని యఖండ వాక్యమును వ్యాకరించు పద్ధతినేర్పఱచి మాపెననియు తెలియచుచున్నది.

## అఖండ వాక్యవిభాగము—విభక్తి.

ఇంతకునీయఖండ వాక్యము విషయమై యింత విచారణమేల అను ప్రశ్న కలుగవచ్చును. భూభాగమున వ్యవహరింపబడు భాషల పరస్పర సంబంధమును దెలిసికొని భాషావటుంబ ములనేర్పరచు విధానమునం దీయఖండ వాక్యలక్షణమునే మనము ముఖ్యముగా గమనింప వలసియుండును. ఏభాషలోనైనను అఖండవాక్యమున దెట్లు ఎప్పుడు వ్యవహరింపబడి యుండెనో మనకు దెలియదుగాదా, అట్టి వాక్యమును మనము భాషావటుంబముల విభాగమున కాధారముగా నెట్లు చేసికొనగలము. అని ప్రశ్నించినచో, నా వాక్యలక్షణములు, తత్సంఘటనారీతులు నా భాషాసంప్రదాయములు నిటీవలబయలుదేరిన వ్యాకరణములలో బ్రతిఫలింపకతప్పదుగావున, నీవ్యాకరణములందలి లక్షణములను బట్టియే యాయా భాషల ప్రత్యేక లక్షణములను భాషాతత్వవేత్తలు గనిపెట్టగలుగుచున్నారని చెప్పవలసియున్నది. కావుననే భాషలను కుటుంబములుగా నేర్పరచుటలో శబ్దశాలముకంటెను వ్యాకరణాంశములకే అనగా వాక్యసంఘటనా రీతులకే లేదాసంపూర్ణ వాక్యస్వరూప లక్షణమునకే ఎక్కువ ప్రాముఖ్య మివ్వవలసియున్నదని చెప్పబడుచున్నది. \* వీని తత్వాన్వయమేమనగా, లోకమున ప్రత్యేకవ్యక్తులరలేనే జాతులయొక్కయు మనస్సంకల్పములు భిన్నములై యుండుటయేగాక ఆయా సంకల్పములను బహిర్గతముచేసి యితరులకు బోధపరచు రీతులుకూడ భిన్నముగ నేయుండుననుట. ఒకనికి స్వభావసిద్ధములుగా దోచిన భావములు భావప్రకటనరీతులు మఱియొకని కస్వాభావికములుగా దోచును. చీనాదేశస్థుని భాషయు నాతని వాక్యసంఘటనారీతియు నాతనికి స్వాభావికముగాదోచునేగాని మనకు బోధపడదు. కర్త, కర్మ, క్రియ ప్రత్యయములు మొదలగు భాషాసామగ్రి

---

\* It is different conception of the sentence and the form it takes which characterise the whole language. However much alike may have been the circumstances by which the first communities of man are surrounded, they yet viewed the world without them and their own relation to it with different eyes. The idea they formed of the sentence and its parts was not the same everywhere. When with growth of consciousness came also the formal expression in utterance of the relations of the several parts of the sentence, it is inevitable that this expression should clothe itself in essentially various forms. When we remember that the sentence and not the isolated word, is the starting point of philology, when we make it what the logician would term 'fundamental divisions' of our classification of speech—there is no longer any difficulty in distinguishing the families of speech and assigning to each its character and place.

(Sayce. The Science of Language Vol. I. P. 3.)

లేఖండ నరడు కేవల ధాతురూపములతోనేట్లు వ్యవహరింపగలడని మనము తలంతుము. మన భాషయు నాతనికట్లేయుండవచ్చును. కావున ప్రతిజాతియు కొన్ని విశేషలక్షణములతో బయలుదేరినప్పుడు వారి భావభేదములందలి రీతులు వారి భాషయందును వాక్యసంఘటనారీతులయందును బ్రతిఫలించి, వానిని భిన్నరూపములనొందించును. కావుననే ఆయాభాషలయందలి వాక్యసంఘటనారీతులనుబట్టియే ఆయాభాషలను కుటుంబములనుగా నేర్పరచుట కవకాశము కలుగుచున్నదని భాషా తత్వవేత్తలు చెప్పుచున్నారు. ఈ వాక్యసంఘటనారీతిని, అనగా—ఒక వాక్యములోని భిన్నభాగములు, వానికిగల పరస్పర సంబంధమును—నూచించునదే వ్యాకరణము.\* ఈ వాక్యసంఘటనారీతులలోగల భేదమునుబట్టియే శబ్దకాస్త్రజ్ఞులిప్పుడు వ్యవహారములోనున్న భాషలను కొన్ని తరగతులుగ విభజించినారు. స్థూలదృష్టితో జూచినచో నవి మూడువిధములుగలవిగ కనబడుచున్నవని యిదివరకే నూచింపబడినది. అందొకటి పదమున ప్రకృతి ప్రత్యయవిభాగముగాని వాక్యమున సాకాంతృపదకదంబకముగాని లేని “ ధాతురూప భాష ”. రెండవది ధాతురూప పదములతోగూడినది. ఇందు భిన్న ధాతుసంయోగముచే న్నగ్ధభేదము నూచింపబడును. వాక్యమున పదములసంబంధము అనగా ఆకాంతృ-వాని స్థానమునుబట్టియే గ్రహింపబడును. దీనిని సంయుక్త ధాతురూప పదభాషయని (agglutinative language) అందురు. మూడవది ప్రత్యయాంత భాష (Inflexional Language). వాక్యవయవములగు పదములకు ప్రకృతి ప్రత్యయవిభాగముకలదు. వాక్యమునందలి యీ పదములకుగల పరస్పర సంబంధము, ఆ పదములపైజేరు ప్రత్యయముల మూలముగా వ్యక్తమగుచుండును. వాక్యమునందలి భిన్నావయవములగు పదములకుగల సంబంధమును దెలుపు నీ ప్రత్యయములనే విధిక్తులందురు.

---

\* The mutual relations of the elements of a sentence as well as of fully formed sentences constitute grammar in its widest sense ; they constitute the morphology of language. We have to discover the different mental points of view from which the structure of the sentence was regarded by the different races of mankind, to investigate and compare the various contrivances and processes through which these points of view eventually, found their fullest expression, to classify the modes of denoting the relations of grammar, at the disposal of language—to analyse the conceptions of grammar to ascertain the true origin and meaning of the so called rules of syntax and keep record of the changes that take place in the arrangement of words."

నామవిభక్తి—క్రియావిభక్తి.

ఈ ప్రత్యయములు నామములపై జేరునవి కొన్ని, క్రియలపై జేరునవి కొన్ని యుండుటచే, నామవిభక్తులు క్రియా విభక్తులునని రెండు విధములుగనున్నవి. గీర్వాణ భాషలో నామముపై జేరు విభక్తి ప్రత్యయములకు 'సుప్ప' లనియు, క్రియలపై జేరువానికి 'తిజ్జు' లనియు పాణిన్యాది వైయాకరణులు సంకేతము నేర్పరచుటచేత సుప్పతిజ్జులు విభక్తులనబరగినవి. "సుప్తిజ్జావిభక్తి సంజ్ఞాస్తః". ఈ సుప్తిజ్జ రూపవిభక్తి ప్రత్యయము లంతమందుగలవే 'పదము' లను సంకేతమునా భాషలోబొందినవి. "సుప్తిజులం పదం". ఇట్టి క్రియా విభక్తి ప్రత్యయముగాని, నామవిభక్తి ప్రత్యయముగాని అంతమందులేని శబ్దము వాక్యములో జేరుటకే యవకాశములేదు గావున, వైయాకరణులు "అపదం న ప్రయుంజీత" అని పదముకాని దానికి బ్రయోగార్హతలేదు, ప్రయోగింపగూడదు అని వ్యక్తముచేసి నిషేధించినారు. అనగా భాషలోని ప్రతివాక్యము సంపూర్ణార్థబోధకమై యుండును గనుకనూ, ఆ సంపూర్ణార్థమును బోధించువాక్యము వ్యాకరింపబడినపు డందలి ప్రతి అయవము, అనగా ప్రతిపదము, లేదా, భాగము, తక్కిన యవయవములతో నేదో విధముగా, సంపూర్ణార్థబోధకొరకు, సంబంధించియే యుండవలయును గావుననూ, అనగా పరస్పరాకాంక్షగలవై యుండవలయును గావున, అట్టి యాకాంక్షలేని శబ్దమూత్రమునకు వాక్యమున స్థానము లేదనుటయే, అపదము ప్రయోగార్హముకాదని వైయాకరణులు చెప్పటంలోగల విశేషము. వైయాకరణులు చెప్పిన వాక్యలక్షణమును, సుప్తిజ్జ ప్రత్యయ స్వరూపలక్షణమును మనము మరికొంత పరిశీలించినచో వైభావ మింకను స్పష్టముగా బోధపడగలదు.

"విభక్తి" అనగా విభాగమని, అది సంపూర్ణార్థబోధకమగు అఖండ వాక్యమునందు వైయాకరణులచే బోధనాసౌకర్యముకొఱకు కల్పింపబడిన విభాగమని, మనమిదివరకే గ్రహించియున్నాము గదా. ఈ విభజించుటలో నా వాక్యమున ముఖ్యభాగములగు నామము క్రియ అనువానిలో క్రియకే వైయాకరణులు ప్రాధాన్యమొసంగినారు. కావుననే సంస్కృత వైయాకరణులు వాక్యమునకు సంపూర్ణత్వము క్రియాపదమువలననే గలుగుచున్నదనియు, నందలి తక్కిన పదములయొక్క స్థితి యాక్రియతో సంబంధించియే— అనగా దానిపై నాధారపడియే యుండుననియు దలంచిరి. అట్లే "క్రియాన్యాయత్వం కారకత్వం" అనిచెప్పి నామ విభక్తులు క్రియతో నన్వయించునవిగావున వానికి కారకము లని పేరుపెట్టినారు. కాని వీరు కల్పించిన సప్తవిభక్తులలోను ఆరు మాత్రమే కారక విభక్తులైనవి. షష్ఠీవిభక్తి నామముతోడనే సాక్షాత్సంబంధము కలదగుటచే కారక విభక్తికాలేదు. అనగా క్రియాపదముతో నన్వయించునది కాదన్నమాట.

వాక్యమున క్రియా ప్రాధాన్యము.

ఈ క్రియా ప్రాధాన్యము వీరు చెప్పిన వాక్యలక్షణమునుబట్టియే వ్యక్తమగుచున్నది.



“ వాక్యం హి నామ కారకాద్యన్విత క్రియాప్రాధాన్యైకవిశేష్యక బోధసాధన పదకదంబకం ”

సాకాంక్షావయవం భేదే పరానాకాంక్షశబ్దకం ।

క్రియాప్రధాన మేకార్థం సగుణం వాక్యముచ్యతే ॥

(వాక్యపదీయం)

“ క్రియానుషంగేణ వినా న పదార్థః ప్రతీయతే ” అనుటయేగాక “ ఆఖ్యాతం సకారక విశేషణం క్రియాప్రాధాన్యైక విశేష్యక బోధకం ” అనుటచే కారకాదులు విశేషణములు, క్రియ విశేష్యమునగుటచే దీని ప్రాధాన్యము సాధింపబడినది.

ఒక వాక్యార్థము సంపూర్ణమై యుండవలయునంటే రాముడు, రాముడు, అనిగాని పులి, పులి అనిగాని యొక నామముచ్ఛరింపబడినంత మాత్రముననే, కాదనియు, వచ్చు అను ఆగమన క్రియానుషంగమునగాని అర్థప్రతీతి కలుగదనియు వీనిభావము. దీనినే “ఆకాంక్ష” యని చెప్పినారు. “ ఆకాంక్షా యోగ్యతా సన్నిధిశ్చ వాక్యార్థజ్ఞానహేతుః ” అని తార్కికులు. ఆకాంక్షయనగా వాక్యమున బ్రయోగింపబడిన ఒక పదమునకు ఏమిటి యొక పదము ప్రయోక్తము కాకపోయినచో అన్వయమునకు భంగముకలిగి అర్థప్రతీతికాక పోవుట తటస్థించునో అట్టి ఆ పదమచ్చట ప్రయోగింపబడియుండుటయే ఆకాంక్ష.

“ పదస్య పదాంతరవ్యతిరేక ప్రయుక్తా న్యయా నను భావకత్వం ” ఆకాంక్ష.

రాముడు, పులి, అన్నంత మాత్రమున సంపూర్ణార్థబోధ కలుగలేదు. రాముడు వెళ్ళెను, పులి వచ్చెను. అని క్రియానుషంగము కలిగినంతనే అది సంపూర్ణ వాక్యమై సంపూర్ణార్థకబోధకమైనది. వాక్యమున నీక్రియను లేదా ధాతువును క్రియాపదముగా జేయుటకు తిజాదులు చేర్పబడుచున్నవి. ఈతిజాదులే క్రియాలిభక్తి ప్రత్యయములుగా జెప్పబడినవి. ఇచ్చట ‘ తిజ్ ’ అనునది పాణిని తన వ్యాకరణ ప్రక్రియలో సంగ్రహ త్వము సౌలభ్యము సాధించుటకుగా కల్పించుకొనిన వ్యాకరణ సంకేతమగు ప్రత్యాహార ఫక్తికి జెందినది. ఇందుజేరిన తి, తః, అన్తి అను ప్రత్యయములకు విభక్తి సంజ్ఞవచ్చుటకు గారణమేమి, ఇవి నామ విభక్తులకంటే నేట్లు భిన్నములగుచున్నవి అని విచారించవలసి యున్నది.

తి, తః, అన్తి; సి, థః, థ; మి, మః, మః; అని క్రియా రూపములలో ధాతువులపై లింగ, వచన భేదమును దెలుపుటకుగా జేర్పబడు చిహ్నములకు తిజ్జలని పేరుపెట్టినవాడు పాణిని. దీనిని బట్టి క్రియాలిభక్తి అనగా, వ్యాపారాశ్రయమై పురుష వచన భేదమును నూచించు సర్వనామ చిహ్నము అని లేలంచున్నది. ప్రథమ మధ్య మౌత్తమ పురుషులను ఏకవచన, ద్వివచన బహువచనములను మూడు వచనములందును

నూచించు తొమ్మిది చిన్నములే ఆత్మనేపద పరస్మైపద భేదముచే పదునెనిమిదై 'తి' యను సంజ్ఞను బడేసినవి. ఈ ప్రత్యయము లాభాషలో కాలాదిభేదమునుబట్టి యనేకవిధములగు మార్పులకు లోబడుచుండుటయు గలదు. వాస్తవముగా నీప్రత్యయము లాయావచనములం దాయాపురుష వాచకములే యగుటచేత నాయాపురుషలలోని సర్వనామ రూపములేయని మనము శంకింపవచ్చును. కాని యీ భాషలోని సర్వనామ రూపములకును క్రియాపదముల తుదినిగానబడు పురుషనూచక భాగములకును ఏమాత్రము సంబంధము కనబడకపోవుటయేగాక, కాలాది భేదమును నూచించునప్పుడు క్రియాపదములలో నీప్రత్యయము లనేకవిధముల మార్పునొందుచుండుటచేత, నివి కేవల సంకేతరూపములుగా గ్రహింపబడి, క్రియా విభక్తి ప్రత్యయములనబడుట తటస్థించినది. ఈ ప్రత్యయములు కేవల పురుషవచన ద్యోతకములేగాని కాలాదిభేదమును నూచించునవికూడ కావు. కాలాది భేదమును నూచించుటకు ఇతర ప్రత్యయములు ఆగమాదులు కలవు. వానిపై నివి చేర్పబడి నప్పు డివియు గొన్ని మార్పులకులోను కావచ్చును. ఇట్లు పరిశీలింపగా నీక్రియావిభక్తు లనునవి నామవిభక్తులవలె సంపూర్ణ వాక్యమునుండి సాకాంతౌవయవములను భేదించుటచే నేర్పడినవిగాక, కేవల క్రియాపద రూపమునందలి పురుషవచన భేదమును మాత్రము నూచించు సర్వనామరూప చిన్నములే యని మనము గ్రహింపవలసియున్నది. నువ్వి భక్తులలో నొకప్రత్యయ మొక్కొక విభక్తిలోని యొక వచనమును నూచించునట్లే క్రియా విభక్తులలోని ఒక్కొక్క ప్రత్యయము ఒక్కొక పురుషయొక్క ఒక వచనమును నూచించుచున్నది.

ఈ ప్రత్యయములనబడునవి సర్వనామ రూపచిన్నములేగావున నాక్రియాపదముల తుదను సర్వనామరూపములే వ్యక్తముగా గనబడుచున్నచో, వీనిని ప్రత్యయమాత్రములుగా గాని, క్రియావిభక్తులనిగాని పరిగణింపవలసిన యావశ్యకతయే లేకపోయెడిది. తుదినినిలచిన సర్వనామ రూపమునకు కాలాదిచిన్నములతో గూడిన ధాతువు విశేషణమైయుండెడిది. ప్రస్తుతము దక్షిణ హిందూదేశ భాషల విషయమున పరిశీలించినచో, చేయుచున్నాను, చేయు చున్నావు, చేయుచున్నాడు, అను వానిలోని ను, వు, డు అనునవి నేను, నీవు, వాడు అను సర్వనామముల భాగములేయనుట వ్యక్తమేగావున, నీభాషలోని విభక్తులలో క్రియా విభక్తులను వానిని జేర్పవలసిన యావశ్యకతయే లేదనవచ్చును. ఇచ్చట సర్వనామమునకే ప్రాధాన్యము. క్రియ అనుదానిలో ధాతు వీ సర్వనామమునకు విశేషణమై నిలుచుచున్నది. గీర్వాణ భాషలోగూడ ప్రథమ పురుష ప్రత్యయములగు 'తి' తి, మొదలగునవి సర్వనామ శబ్దమునకు సంబంధించినవేయైనను నవి మిక్కిలి మారిపోయియుండుటచే సర్వ నామావశిష్ట భాగములుగా గ్రహింపబడుటలేదు. కావుననే ప్రాచీన హైందవ వైయాకర ñులు, వీనినట్లు తలంపక క్రియా విభక్తులుగానే చెప్పినారు. ఐనను “ఫలవ్యాపార యోర్ధాతురాశ్రయే తు తిః స్మృతః” అనికొందరు ధాతునిష్ఠులగు ఫలవ్యాపారములకు తిజ్జే ఆశ్రయమని చెప్పుటచే వీని నిజలక్షణము గ్రహించ బడలేదని చెప్పుటకు నవకాళము

లేదు. ఈ తి, తః, మి, మః మొదలగునవి కాలాదిభేదమును నూచించు క్రియారూపములలో నింకను విశేషములగు మార్పులను జెందియుండుటచే నచ్చట వీని స్వరూపమును గుర్తించుటకే సాధ్యమగుటలేదు. ఇట్లు క్రియా విభక్తులనబడు తిజాదుల విషయములోనవి యా క్రియాపదములలో నిర్వర్తించు ధర్మమును (function) బట్టియైనను అవి సర్వసామరూపముల యవశిష్టభాగములై యుండునేమోయని యూహించుటకును వాని పోలికల జాడలు తీయుటకును అవకాశమున్నదిగాని, నామ విభక్తుల విషయములోనట్టి యూహకైన నవకాశమేమియు కలుగుట లేదు.

ఈ నామవిభక్తులకు సుష్టులని పాణినిసంకేతము. సు, అను ప్రథమైక వచన ప్రత్యయముతో ప్రారంభించి, పవర్ణాంతమగు 'సుప్' అను సప్తమీ బహువచన ప్రత్యయముతో నంతమగు నీయిరునదొక్క ప్రత్యయములకు 'సుప్' అని ప్రత్యాహార సంజ్ఞ కల్పించుటచే నామవిభక్తులు సుష్టులైనవి. ఈ శబ్దములు సుబంతములైనవి. ఈ సుష్టులిరునదొక్కటియు మూడు వచనములను నూచించు ఏడు విభక్తులైనవి. వీనికి ప్రథమా ద్వితీయాది సంఖ్యావాచక శబ్దములే సంకేతములైనవి. ఆనాడు పాణినిచేసిన యా సంకేతమే యీ నాటికిని హిందూ దేశభాష లన్నిటిలో ననుసరింపబడుచున్నది. అయితే యీ ప్రథమాది సంకేతము పాణినిచేసినను, ఈ భాషలో సంపూర్ణ వాక్యము నందలి పదములకు గల సంబంధ రీతులు సప్తవిధములుగా గ్రహింపబడియుండుట అంతకుంటెను ప్రాచీనము కావచ్చును. కొన్ని ఇండోయూరపీయన్ భాషలలో నాలుగే విభక్తులగుటచే నివి క్రమముగా జెరుగుచువచ్చెననియు దలంపవలసియున్నది.

విభక్తులు—వాని యర్థములు.

ఈ భాషలలో విభక్తులేడు అని చెప్పుటలోగల విశేషమేమనగా నీభాషలను ప్రాచీనకాలమున వ్యవహరించినవారు అందలి సంపూర్ణార్థ బోధకంబగు వాక్యమందలి యవయవముల సంబంధ మేడురీతుల నుండునట్లు భావించిరిని తలంపదగియుండుటయే. వాక్యమున క్రియాపదమునకు బ్రాధాన్య మివ్వబడి యదివిశేషముగా గ్రహింపబడి యున్నందున వాక్యములోని తక్కిన పదములన్నియు దానికి విశేషణములు. అనగా క్రియాపదముతో నన్వయించునవై యుండవలయును. ఈ కారణముచేతనే తక్కిన విభక్తులు “కారకము”లు క్రియాన్వయముకలవి యైనవి. కాని యేడు విభక్తులలో సంబంధార్థమును జెలుపునదిగావున నామముతో నన్వయించునదగుటచే, వష్టివిభక్తికి మాత్రము క్రియాన్వయిత్యములేదు కావున అది కారకముకాదు. తక్కిన యారే కారకములు. ఒక నామవాచకపదముతో మఱియొక నామవాచక పదము సంబంధార్థమున సమన్వయించునని భావింపబడినట్లే, ఒక వాక్యమున నామవాచక పదములు క్రియాపదముతో నన్వయించు రీతులు లేదా అర్థములు అరువిధములుగానుండినట్లు వారిచే భావింపబడినది. అందు మొదటిది కర్తృత్వము అనగా క్రియనుచేయువానిని లేదా క్రియా ఫలమును

చూచుచున్నది. ఇది ప్రథమా విభక్తి. కర్తకు ఈప్రితమనుగునది, అనగా కర్తచేయు క్రియకు ఫలముగా నాతడు పొందనిచ్చయించినది కర్మ సంజ్ఞకలదగును. దానిని చూచించుకబ్బము “అం” మొదలగు ద్వితీయా ప్రత్యయములను గ్రహించి వాక్యమున బ్రయోగింపబడుచుండును. కర్తచేయు కర్మకు సాధనభూతము కరణము, దీనికి చూచించు కబ్బము తృతీయా ప్రత్యయములతో గూడియుండును. ఒకదానినుండి విశ్లేషము కలిగిన నది దేనినుండి కలుగునో అది అపాదానసంజ్ఞ కలదగును. అది పంచమీ ప్రత్యయములను గ్రహించును. క్రియాకాధారమగునది అధికరణము అయ్యకమును చూచించు కబ్బమునకు సప్తమీవిభక్తి వచ్చును. పరిశీలించినచో నింక ననేకవిధములగు నర్థములు లేకపోలేదు గాని, మొదట నఖండ వాక్యము విభాగింపబడినపు డీ సప్తవిధార్థములే గ్రహింపబడియుండుటచే గాఢములు సప్తవిభక్తులే యేర్పడుటయు, నితరార్థములనుగూడ వీనిలోనేదో యొకదాని యందంతర్భూతముచేసియో, లేదా ప్రతిపదవిభక్తియని, యొకదానిని కల్పించుకొనియో వైయాకరణులు సరిపెట్టికొని యూరకుండిరి.

ఇట్టియర్థములు క్రియాన్వయము గలవి ఆరువిధములగ మాత్రమే గ్రహింపబడినను ఇంక ననేకార్థములనుగూడ నీవిభక్తి ప్రత్యయములు కబ్బములపై జేరుచునేయున్నవి. వాటికన్నిటికిని ప్రయోగములను బట్టి ప్రత్యేక విధులు నూత్రములును కల్పింపబడినవి. ఈ ప్రత్యయములనుబడువానికి స్వతంత్రమగు నర్థమేమియు నిప్పుడు తెలియుటలేదు గనుక నీ యారు విధములగు భావములేగాక వ్యవహారమునుబట్టి యింక ననేకార్థములలోగూడ వీని నుపయోగించుకొనక తప్పినదికాదు. వాస్తవముగా నిట్టియర్థములనేకములుగానుండును. అట్టియర్థములను తత్తద్దర్థబోధక కబ్బములను ప్రధానకబ్బమునకుజేర్చి చెప్పకొనుచుండుట సహజరీతి. అట్టిరీతియే సంయుక్తపద రూపభావలలో గనబడుచున్నది.

ద్రావిడభాషలనబడు నీదక్షిణదేశ భాషలలో సామాన్యముగా నర్థభేదములను చూచించుటకు తత్తద్దర్థబోధకములగు కబ్బములే చేర్పబడుచుండును. గావున సంస్కృతాద్యార్య భాషలలోవలెనే విభక్తులేడేకలవని తలంచిన తత్తద్భాషావైయాకరణులవలెనే మనమును తలంప నవసరములేదని కాల్వెల్ పండితుడు చెప్పియున్నాడు.\* ఏల యనగా

\* On proceeding to analyse the case-formation of the Dravidian languages, we shall follow the order in which they have been arranged by Dravidian grammarians, which is the same as that of the Sanskrit. The imitation of Sanskrit in this particular was certainly an error; for whilst in Sanskrit there are eight cases only, the number of cases in Tamil, Telugu, etc., is almost indefinite. Every post position annexed to a noun constitutes, properly speaking, a new case; and therefore the number of such cases depends upon the requirements of the speaker, and the different shades of meaning he wishes to express,

(Comp. Grammar, P. 254—55.)

సంస్కృతాది భాషలలో విభక్తులు (సంబోధనముతోగూడచేరి) ఎనిమిది మాత్రమే యైయుండగా తెలుగు, తమిళము మొదలగు దక్షిణ దేశభాషలలోనవి యసంఖ్యాక ములైయుండవచ్చును. ఒక నామవాచక శబ్దము తరువాత నేయర్థమునైన నొక శబ్దము చేర్చబడినచో నదియొక విభక్తియేయగును. కావున నిందీవిభక్తుల సంఖ్య క్త్యవివక్షాధీనమై అర్థభేదములనుబట్టి యుండునేగాని నియతమైయుండుననుట కవకాశము లేదు. భాషలోనాతడు ప్రయోగించు భావచ్ఛాయలనుబట్టి యవి పెరుగుచు నేయుండును. అని యాతని భావము.

అయితే యీ దేశభాష వైయాకరణులు మొదటినుండియు సంస్కృతభాష పండితులై తత్సంప్రదాయానుసారతే యైయుండుటచేత, నీభాషలకు వ్యాకరణము రచించునప్పుడు సంస్కృత వ్యాకరణ సాంప్రదాయక పద్ధతుల నవలంబించిరేగాని, యీ భాషల సహజలక్షణములను బరిశీలించి తదనుగుణముగ రచించినవారు కాలేదు. అప్పుడది సాధ్యమైన పనియు కాదు. తుదకుసౌకర్యముకొరకని చెప్పచూ కార్టెల్ పండితుడు కూడ నవలంబించినట్లే, వారును సంస్కృతమున నలవాటైన ఆ పద్ధతినే యవలంబించి తద్భాషా సంప్రదాయములను తద్వ్యాకరణ సంతతులనుగూడ నీవ్యాకరణములలోనికి జొప్పించిరి.

**ఆర్యద్రావిడ భాషావిభక్తులు—వాని భేదము.**

ఇకనీ విభక్తుల సంఖ్యావిషయముననేగాక వీని యితర లక్షణముల విషయమునగూడ సంస్కృతాద్యార్య భాషలకును తెనుగు, తమిళము మొదలగు దక్షిణ దేశభాషలకును విశేష వ్యత్యాసముకలదు. ఆయా విభక్త్యర్థముల నామవాచక శబ్దములపై జేర్చబడు చిహ్నములు ద్రావిడాది భాషలలో వాని ప్రత్యేకతను నూచింపగల స్వతంత్రశబ్దములుగానే గనబడుచున్నవి. కొన్ని మాత్రము తమ మూలార్థమును గోలుపోయి ప్రత్యయావస్థను బొందినవని చెప్పదగియున్నను, వాని పూర్వచరిత్ర నించుక యన్వేషించినచో వాని మూలరూపములను గనిపట్టి యవి స్వతంత్ర శబ్దముల యవిశిష్ట భాగములని చూపుట యసాధ్యముకాబోదు. ఈ కుటుంబమునకు జెందిన కొన్ని భాషలలో అనగా బాగా నాగరకత, అభివృద్ధి నందని భాషలలో కొన్ని విభక్తులకు ప్రత్యేక ప్రత్యయములే లేవు. ఇందుకుదాహరణముగా 'తుద' భాషలో ప్రథమా, ద్వితీయా, మృత్యులకు ప్రత్యేక విభక్తి ప్రత్యయములు లేవు. తుదభాషలోనేకాదు, తెనుగునగూడ కొన్ని యమహద్దేశ్య శబ్దములపై నీవిభక్త్యర్థముల దెలుపుటకు ప్రత్యేక ప్రత్యయములనుగాని పదములనుగాని జేర్చ నావశ్యకతయే యుండదు. చూడుడు—ఆ చెట్టుపడిపోయినది; వాడు చెట్టుకొట్టి వేసినాడు. ఆ చెట్టునీడ నాశ్రయింతము. దీనిని బట్టి చూడగా నాయావిభక్త్యర్థములను నూచించు మార్గములు కాలక్రమమును పెరిగి వానిని నూచించుటకు కొన్ని శబ్దములు

నియతముగా ప్రయోగింపబడుచున్న మఱికొంత కాలమున కవి కొంతమూర్ఖునిొంది పిదప నూచకములు మాత్రమగుచుండుట తటస్థించినదని తెలియవచ్చుచున్నది.

సంస్కృతాద్యార్య భాషలలోని విభక్తి ప్రత్యయములు ఏకవచన ద్వివచన బహువచనములందు భిన్నరూపములు కలవైయున్నవి. ద్రావిడ భాషలలో నట్లుకాదు. వీనికి వచనభేదము లేదు. రెండు వచనములలోను, ఒక్కటే ప్రత్యయము లేదా శబ్దము, తత్త్వభిన్నత్యమును నూచించుటకుగా జేర్పబడును. ఇది, ఏకవచనమున ప్రాతిపదికమునైన, బహువచనమున నాప్రాతిపదిక నై జేర్పబడిన బహువచన చిహ్నమునైన చేర్పబడును. ఈ ప్రత్యయమందుగాని శబ్దమందుగాని సామాన్యముగా నేవిధ మగుమార్పు నుండదు. పూర్వమునగల ప్రాతిపదికవందలి స్వరమునుబట్టి ఒకప్పుడు స్వరసామ్యముచే (Harmonic sequence of vowels) విభక్తియందలి ను నికావచ్చును, కు అనునదికి కావచ్చును (ఉదా—హరిని, శంభును; హరికి, రామునకు), గాని యీ మార్పు భిన్నవర్ణము లంతమందుగల సంస్కృత శబ్దములపై విభక్తి ప్రత్యయములు నిలిచినప్పుడు గలుగు మార్పువంటిది కాదు. సంస్కృతమున అకారాంత శబ్దములపై ను ప్రత్యయము విసర్గగామాది నిలుచును. కాని ఋకారాంత శబ్దములపైని హలంతశబ్దములపైని కేవలము లోపించును. అకారాంతశబ్దములపై విన్ తృతీయా బహువచనమున జేరుచుండగా, ఇతర శబ్దములపై నది భిన్న\* గా మారుచున్నది. ఇట్లే శబ్దాంత్యవర్ణమునుబట్టి యీ విభక్తి ప్రత్యయములు మారుటయుగలదు. ఇట్లు శబ్దభేదమును బట్టియు, శబ్దాంతమునగల వర్ణభేదమును బట్టియు విభక్తి ప్రత్యయములలో మార్పుగలుగుట ద్రావిడ భాషలలోలేదు. కావుననే ద్రావిడ భాషలలోని నామ విభక్తిప్రక్రియ యొకేవిధము గలదై యున్నదని చెప్పబడుచున్నది. \* విభక్తి ప్రత్యయములు లేదా తన్వ్యోతక శబ్దములు పరమైనపుడు ప్రాతిపదికలో నొక్కొకప్పుడు కొంత మార్పుగలుగవచ్చును. ఈ మార్పు కొన్ని శబ్దములపై నౌపవిభక్తిక ప్రత్యయములుచేరుట మూలముగా జేర్పబడుచున్నది. దీని వలన గలుగు ఫలితమేమనగా, వీని మూలముగా ప్రాతిపదికము విశేషణముగా మారుచుండుటయే. విభక్తి పరమైనపుడు ప్రాతిపదికపై జేరు కొన్ని శబ్దములను నౌపవిభక్తికములని వైయాకరణులు సంకేతముచేసినారు. కాని వీరవి యచ్చటనెందుకు చేరుచున్ననో, ఇచ్చట

\* There is only one declension, I conceive, properly so called, in the Dravidian Languages, as in the Scythian family generally. Those varieties of inflexional increments which have been called declension by some scholars, both native and European, appear to me to constitute but one declension, for there is no difference between one and another with respect to the signs of case. (Caldwell-Com, Dr. Gr.)

నివి నిర్వర్తించు ధర్మమేమా వీని తత్వమెట్టిదో అని పరిశీలించినట్లగుపడదు. కావున నీభాషలలోని జౌపవిభక్తికముల స్వరూపమును వాని ధర్మమును గ్రహించినచో నీ భాషా పరిణామ తత్వముకూడ కొంత బోధపడగలదని తోచుచున్నది. కావున వాని నిందుక పరిశీలించుము.

### జౌపవిభక్తికములు.

తెలుగులో “ఇ, టి, తి” తమిళమున ‘ఇన్’ “అత్తు” అనునవి, కన్నడమున ‘అద్’ అనునది జౌపవిభక్తికము లనబడుచున్నవి. ఈ ప్రత్యయము లీభాషలలో విభక్తి ప్రత్యయము చేరినప్పుడేగాక, కేవల సంబంధార్థమును దెలుపు నప్పుడుగూడ ప్రాతిపదికముపై జేరుచున్నవి. ఉదా—తె. కాలు-కాలినొప్పి, నోరు-నోటిమాట, నూయి-నూగినరు. త. కుళం-కుళత్తుమిన్. క. మరమ్-మరద కొంబు.

తెలుగులో, ‘ఇ, టి, తి’ అనునవి మూడు ప్రత్యయములు ప్రత్యేకముగా గనబడుచున్నను, వీనిలో ఇకారమే ప్రధానమైనది. ఇందు ఇకారము వైనిలేని టకార తకారము లతోగూడిన రూపములు గాన వచ్చుటలేదు. ఈ ‘ఇ’ అనునది, తమిళమునందలి ‘ఇన్’ అనుదానిని సంబంధించినదేగావచ్చును. ఇన్ అనునది ‘ని’ అనురూపమునగూడ తెలుగులో సామాన్యముగా అకారంత తత్సమ శబ్దములపై గాఢవచ్చుచున్నది. రామ-రాముని (రాముని కృప). కాని సామాన్యముగా నితర దేశ్యశబ్దములపై నీవర్ణములు చేరకయే సంబంధార్థము నూచితమగుచుండుటయేగాక, విభక్తి ప్రత్యయములుచేరినప్పుడు కూడ నివి చేరుటలేదు. ఉదా—హరి-హరిపూజ, తల్లి-తల్లిపాలు, చెట్టు-చెట్టు కొమ్మ, తండ్రిమాట, అన్నపాలు, పాన్-పాన్ముడి, కడు-కడునడై.

అనగా నీభాషలో నొక నామవాచక శబ్దముపై మరియొకటి నిలిచినపుడు దాని స్థానమునుబట్టియే మొదటిది రెండవదానికి విశేషణమగుచున్నదన్నమాట. \*ఇది యీ భాషలలో నతిప్రాచీనమగు సంప్రదాయమైయుండును. ఈ విశేషణ విశేష్యభావమును పూర్వపదాంత్య వర్ణమును ద్విత్వము నొందించుటచే నూచించు నాచారము తరువాత బయలు దేరినట్లగుచున్నది. ఈ పద్ధతి తమిళములో గనబడినట్లుగా దెనుగున గనబడదు. కాని దాని స్వరూపమును మన మీభాషలోగూడ గుర్తింపలేకపోము. ఉదా.—త. నాడు-నాట్టు వరక్కం (custom of the country) దీనికి సప్తమివిభక్తి ప్రత్యయమగు

\*The majority of adjectives in all the Dravidian dialects are nouns of quality or relation, which become adjectives by position alone, without any structural change whatever, and without ceasing to be in themselves nouns of quality.

‘ఇల్’ చేర్చిపప్పుడుకూడా నాడు-నాట్టు అగుచున్నది. నాడు-(సప్త) నాట్టిల్ (in the country). అనగా విభక్త్యర్థక ప్రత్యయము, లేదా శబ్దము పరమందు చేరినపుడు పూర్వమందున్న ప్రాతిపదిక విశేషణత్వమును బొందుచున్నదన్నమాట. ఈ విశేషణత్వము అందలి తుది హల్లు ద్విత్వమును పరుషత్వమును బొందుటవలన దానికి కలుగుచున్నది. త. నడ-నట్టిలం, త. ఇరుంబు-ఇరుప్పక్కోల్, తె. ఇనుము-ఇనుప కడ్డి. దీనినే “విశేషణ సమాసములలో నామృది కనుమృదుల మువర్ణమునకు పక్ష పవర్ణంబులగు” అని ఆంధ్ర వైయాకరణులు పవర్ణవిధానముచే నూచించినారు. ఇట్టిదే-పాంబు-పాము-పా పటేడు. త. ఆటు=river ఆట్టు క్కరై = river bank, నాడు- నాట్టుపురం; తె. ఏటు- ఏటిగట్టు; నీరు-నీటిబుగ్గ; నేయి-నేతిచెంబు; పల్లు-(పన్ను)-పంటినొప్పి; ఈ మొదలగు రూపములలో తమిళమున పదాంత ‘అ’ కార టుకారాదులు ద్విత్వమును పరుషత్వమును బొంది విశేషణత్వమును బొందగా, తెలుగున కొన్ని ద్విత్వమును కొన్ని పరుషత్వమును బొందుటయేగాక, మఱియొక ‘ఇ’ కారమునుగూడ గ్రహించుచున్నది. వై బువర్ణాంత శబ్దములుగూడ తమిళమున ద్విత్వమును పరుషత్వమును బొందియుండగా, తెలుగున నది పరుషత్వమును బొందుటయేగాక ఒక ‘అ’ కారమునుగూడ గ్రహించుచున్నది. ఇట్టి రూపములను బోల్చిపరిశీలించగా, పదాంత్యహల్లుకు ద్విత్వము కలుగుటచేతనేగాక, వానిపై ఇ కార, అకారములు చేరుటచేతగూడ నామవాచక పదములకు విశేషణత్వము సిద్ధించుచున్నట్లు తెలియుచున్నది. ఈ ‘ఇ’కారము తమిళమున ‘ఇణ్’ అను ఔపవిభక్తిక ప్రత్యయముతో సంబంధించినదై, మొదట స్థలవాచకము, పిదప సప్తమివిభక్తి ప్రత్యయము గూడ నైన “ఇల్” అను దాని రూపాంతరము లేదా అవశిష్ట భాగము అయియుండును. ఈ ‘ఇ’కారమే తెలుగులోని డుమంత సర్వనామ రూపములపై జేరి వానికిని విశేషణత్వము కల్పించుచున్నది. అవణ్, ఇవణ్, ఎవణ్ అను శబ్దముల ప్రథమారూపము అవన్టు, వాన్డు, వాడు—వీడు, ఎవడు, కాగా, దీని ప్రథమేతరవిభక్తి రూపము ‘ఇ’కార సహితమై విశేషణ రూపమైనది. అవణ్ + ఇ=అవని-వాని, ఇవణ్ + ఇ=ఇవని-వీని, ఎవణ్—ఎవని వేని. వాని పుస్తకమన్నపుడు సంబంధార్థకమును, ప్రథమేతర విభక్త్యర్థము నైనది. ఇట్లే పాపటేడు, ఇనుపకోలు అనువానిలో విశేషణరూపాదక చిహ్నముగానున్న ‘అ’ అనునది, ఈ ఇకారమువలెనే, ఆత్మార్థక సర్వనామములలో నేకవచన బహువచన రూపములు రెండిటిలోనూ గానవచ్చుచున్నది. తాను-అనుదానికి ‘తన’ అనునది విశేషణరూపమగుటకు ఈ అకారమే కారణముగదా. బహు. తాను—తమ, మేము-మన. తమిళ కన్నడములలోగూడ తాణ్-అనునది ప్రథమేతర విభక్తులలో హ్రస్వత్వమునుమాత్రము బొంది-తణ్-అగుచున్నది. ఇదియే తాము, మేము శబ్దముల ప్రథమేతర విభక్తికి అంగముగూడ నగుచున్నది. తెలుగున ప్రథమేతరవిభక్తి ప్రత్యయములు అకారాంతములగు తమ, మన అను వానిపై జేర్పబడుచున్నవి. తాము-తమచేత, తమయందు, మనము-మనచేత, మనయందు. ఇతర శబ్దములలోగూడ ప్రథమేతర విభక్తులందు బహువచన చిహ్నముగు ‘లు’వర్ణ



మునై 'అ'కారము చేరిన తరువాతనే ఆయా విభక్తి ప్రత్యయములు చేర్పబడుచున్నవి. రాములు-రాములచేత, రాములయందు, రాములవలన etc., ఈ 'అ'కారము ఆత్మార్థక సర్వనామ ప్రథమేతర విభక్త్యంగ రూపమున ఏకవచనమందును అనగా 'తన' అనుదానిలోను కనబడుచున్నను, సామాన్యముగా నితర సర్వనామ రూపములలోగాని, శబ్దములలోగాని బహువచన రూపములందు మాత్రమే విశేషముగా బాడనూపుచున్నది. అట్లే 'ఇ'కారమున కేకవచన రూపములందు ప్రాచుర్యంబెక్కువ. ఔపవిభక్తికంబనబడు నీ 'ఇ'కారమే ప్రథమేతర విభక్తులు పరమైనపుడు ప్రాతిపదికమునైతేరి నామవాచక శబ్దమును విశేషణముగా మార్చుచున్నది. కాని 'డు' మంత శబ్దములపై దీనిని వైయాకరణులు 'ని'గాగమముగా గ్రహించుచున్నారు. వాస్తవముగా నీనిగాగమములొని 'ఇ'కారము ఔప విభక్తిక ఇకారమే, అందలి నకారము ప్రాతిపదికకు జేరినదే గాని ఆగమము కాదు. ఇది తచ్చబ్ధార్థక సర్వనామమందే మొదట నేర్పడినట్లగపడుచున్నది. అవన్ - అవర్. అవన్ - అనన్తు - వాన్తు - వాండు అనియు, అవర్ - అవరు, వారు, అనియుకాగా, ప్రథమేతర విభక్త్యంగము, లేదా విశేషణరూపమునందు 'ఇ'నేరి 'అవన్ + ఇ = అవని - వాని - అనియైనది. అట్లే - అవర్ + ఇ = వారి. వీనిపై విభక్తి ప్రత్యయములు చేరగా (ఏ) వానిచేత, వానియందు; (బ) వారిచేత, వారియందు, అనురూపము లేర్పడినవి. బహువచనమున 'వారు' పై మరల 'లు' వర్ణము చేరినపుడు వారలచేత, వారలయందు అని ఇకారమునకుబడులు 'అ' అను విశేషణద్యోతక ప్రత్యయమే వచ్చినది. అవన్ - నుండి వాని, ప్రథమేతర విభక్త్యంగమైనట్లే (అవన్ - వాడు, ఇవన్ - వీడు వలెనే, రామన్ - రాముడు; భీమన్ - భీముడు; మగన్ - మగడు వంటి) ఇతర డుమంత శబ్దముల ప్రథమేతర విభక్త్యంగము రాముని, మగని, భీముని, అని యగుటచే, వైయాకరణులిచ్చుట ప్రత్యేకముగా 'ఇ' వర్ణమును గుర్తింపలేక 'ని' అను దానినంతను ఆగమముగా గ్రహించుటచే 'ని'గాగమ విధానమును, జేయవలసినవారైనారు. వాడు అనునది అవన్ అను దానిపరిణత రూపమని గ్రహించినచో, ద్వితీయాది విభక్తులలోని వాని - అనునది 'అవన్ + ఇ' అనుదాని పరిణతరూపమే యని యెట్లు నిశ్చయింపవలగుదుమో, అట్లే రాముడు మొదలగు డుమంత శబ్దముల ప్రాచీనరూపము 'రామన్' అయి యుండునని గ్రహించినచో 'రాముని' అను విశేషణ (పశ్చిమ) రూపములొని 'ని' అనునది 'ని' గాగమముగాక రామన్ అనుదానిలోని తుది నకారముపై విశేషణత్వ ద్యోతక 'ఇ'కారము చేరుటచే నేర్పడినదే యని తెలిసికొనవలగుదుము\*. ఇట్టి యాప విభక్తిక 'ఇ'కారము, సామాన్యముగా నేకవచనమునందును, క్వాచిత్యముగ బహువచన మందును ప్రథమేతర విభక్త్యంగమున ముఖ్యముగా పశ్చిమవిభక్తిరూపమున గనబడుచుండు

\* దీనినిబట్టి యీ 'ని' గాగమములొని 'ఇ'కారము డుమంతపదముల ప్రాచీన చరిత్రద్యోతక చిహ్నముగా (a historic survival) గ్రహింపదగిన దగుచున్నది.

‘ఇ’కారము నొక్కటేయనియు, సామాన్యముగా ప్రథమేతర బహువచన రూపములందును, కర్మధారయ సమాసములలో పక్ష పవర్ణాదులందును కనబడు, ‘అ’కారమును, ఈ రెండునూగూడ నామవాచకరూపములను విశేషణములుగా మార్పుట కుపయోగపడుచుండెడు ‘ఇల్’ అల్ అను శబ్దముల రూపాంతరములేయనియు మనము గ్రహింపవలసి వచ్చుచున్నది.

ఈ ‘అ’నునది కన్నడ భాషలో ‘మరద’ అను షష్ఠీవిభక్తి రూపములలో ఏకవచనమునను, ‘మరగళ్’ అని బహువచన రూపమునను గూడ కనబడుచున్నది. అనగా ఏకవచనమున ‘అత్తు’ రూపాంతరమగు ‘అదు’ అనుదానినైన, బహువచనమున తెలుగులో వలెనే ‘గళ్’ అను బహువచన ప్రత్యయమునైన, ‘అ’ అనునదే చేరినదన్నమాట. తెమిళమున ‘అత్తు’ పై ‘ఇక్’ చేరుటగూడకలను. మరం, మరత్తల్-మరత్తినాల్, మరత్తాడు, మరత్తినొడు (మర + అత్తు + ఇక్ + బడు). అత్తు + ఇ అనుదానికి సంబంధించినదే తెనుగున ‘తి’, అనునది. ఇది తరువాత రేఖాని సంయోగము కలిగినప్పుడు ‘టి’ కూడ నైనది. ఇచ్చట అత్తునై-ఇ చేరినట్లే కన్నడమున ‘అదు’ పై ‘అ’ చేరినది (cf. మరద). తెమిళమునందలి ‘మరత్తినొడు’ మొదలగు రూపములలో అత్తుపై జేర్పబడిన “ఇక్” అను దానినిబట్టి తెలుగునందలి యాపవిభక్తిక “ఇ”కారము యొక్క మూలరూపమును మనము గుర్తింపవచ్చునుగదా. ఈ “ఇక్” అనునది స్థలవాచకమగు “ఇల్” అనుదాని రూపాంతరమనికూడ నూహింపవచ్చును. ఈ “ఇ”కారమువలెనే “అ” అనునది కూడ “అల్” అనుదాని రూపాంతరమగుననుటకు సందేహములేదు. అల్ ఇల్ ఉల్ అనునవి స్థలవాచకములు. అ, ఇ, ఉ అను నిర్దిష్టార్థక సర్వనామముల రూపములనుండి యీ భాషలలో ననేక శబ్దములు బయలుదేరినవి. ‘ల’కారాంతములగు నీమూడు శబ్దములు స్థలవాచకములై యీ భాషలలో సప్తమీవిభక్తి ప్రత్యయములుగా గూడ నున్నవి. (Cf. ఇల్-ఇల్లు, క. అల్, అల్లి, ఒళ్- సప్తమీ ప్రత్యయములు. తె-లో, లోపల, - సప్తమీ ప్రత్యయములు. త-ఇల్.) కాడ్జెల్ పండితుడు “ఇ” అనునది “ఇల్” అనుదానికి సంబంధించినదనే చెప్పినాడుకాని, “అ” అనునది “అదు” అను సర్వనామమునకు సంబంధించియుండునని తలచినాడు. సర్వనామములలో తాక్-తక్-తన అనునది తక్ + అదు=తనదు అనుదానినుండి తుది “దు” వర్ణలోపముచే నేర్పడియుండ వచ్చునని ఆతని యూహ. “తక్ + అగు” = తన (దియగు) అను నర్థమున “అ” ధాతువునకు సంబంధించినదియు కావచ్చును. కాని ఇల్-ఇక్ అనుదానినిబట్టి “అ” అనునది “అల్” కీసంబంధించినదే యనుట సమంజసముగా గనబడును. ఇంతవరకు లేలిన దేమనగా నీభాషలలోని యాపవిభక్తిక ప్రత్యయము లనబడునవికూడ ఒకప్పుడు ప్రత్యేక స్వతంత్రములై యున్న శబ్దముల యవశిష్టభాగములనియు, నివిపూర్వమందున్న నామవాచక పదమును విశేషణముగా జేయుటకు, లేదా సంబంధార్థమును నూచించుటకుగా నొక కాలమున ప్రయోగింపబడినవనియు, కావుననే యివి సంబంధార్థక ప్రత్యయములు లేదా

షష్ఠీవిభక్తి ప్రత్యయములుగాగూడ కనబడుచున్నవనియు, వీనిపై నాయాయర్థములను బోధించు శబ్దములుచేరి యాయావిభక్త్యర్థములను నూచించుచుండగా, సంస్కృత భాషా మర్యాద నీభాషలను వ్యాకరించినవా రాయాశబ్దములను విభక్తి ప్రత్యయములని, నడుమ నున్న యీ విశేషణద్యోతక ప్రత్యయములను ఔపవిభక్తికములని, ఆగమములని పరిగణింప జొచ్చిరని తెలియుచున్నది. ఈ కారణముచేత నీభాషలలో సంస్కృతమందు వలె నేడే విభక్తులనుటయు; చేత, వలన, కంటె, పట్టి, లోపల, అందు మొదలగునవి విభక్తిప్రత్యయము లనుటయు, నీవిభక్తులుపరమైనపుడు నడుమ నౌపవిభక్తికము లాగమముగా వచ్చునని జెప్పుటయు, కేవల సంస్కృతభాషా మర్యాద ననుసరించి చెప్పినదేగాని, యీభాషల పరిణామపరిస్థితులను పరిశీలించి చెప్పినదిగా లేదనియు వ్యక్తమగుచున్నది. ఈ భాషలలో విభక్తులనబడువాని స్వరూప పరిణామములనుననుమించుక గమనించినచో నీ విషయమింకను బోధపడగలదు. సంస్కృత సామ్యముచే జెప్పబడిన సప్తసంఖ్యాకములగు నామ విభక్తులనుగూర్చి ముందు పరిశీలింతము.

ద్రావిడభాషలలోని నామ విభక్తులు.

మొదటిది ప్రథమావిభక్తి. దీనికి సంస్కృతమున నాయావచనములను నూచించు ప్రత్యేక ప్రత్యయములుకలవు. అందొక ప్రత్యయము విభక్తి వచనములనుకలిపి నూచింపగలదు. ఇంతేకాదు, కొన్ని ప్రత్యయములు లింగమునుగూడ నూచింపగలవు. “ఆః” అనునది స్త్రీపుంశబ్ద ప్రథమా బహువచనమును నూచించగా, “అని” అనునది నపుంశకలింగ ప్రథమా బహువచనమును నూచించును. ద్రావిడ భాషలలోనిట్టి సంప్రదాయమగపడదు. ప్రథమ అనునది ఒక విభక్తియని చెప్పటకే యవకాశములేదు. ప్రాతిపదికయే లేదా నామమే ప్రథమైక వచనమని చెప్పవచ్చును. దానికి బహువచన చిహ్నము చేర్చినచో, నది దాని బహువచన రూపమగును: అవన్-అవర్, వాన్డు - వాన్డు; నాన్ - నామ్, ఏన్ - ఏమ్ - ఏము; మరం - మరంగళ్, మ్రాను - మ్రాంకులు; తండ్రి - తండ్రులు; అక్క - అక్కలు; కన్ను - కన్నులు; వనము - వనములు.

తమిళమునగూడ ప్రథమైక వచనరూపము “పెయరే” నామవాచక రూపమే. అదియే ప్రథమేతర విభక్తులలో నంగ (baṣa) మగుచున్నది అని తమిళ వైయాకరణులు చెప్పుచున్నారు. కాని అమ్మంత శబ్దములలో అనగా మరం మొదలగు శబ్దములలో నీ “అం” అనునది ప్రథమేతర విభక్తులలోనేకవచన రూపములందు లోపించుచుండుటచేత, ఇది ప్రథమావిభక్తి చిహ్నమేమోయని తలంచుట కవకాశమున్నను, బహువచన రూపము లలో నన్నివిభక్తులలోనుగూడ నిలిచియుండుటచేత, నిది ప్రథమాచిహ్నముకాదనకతప్పదు. సంస్కృతమందలి నపుంశక శబ్దములపై ప్రథమా, ద్వితీయైక వచనముల “అం” ప్రత్యయము కనబడుటచే నిదియు నట్టిదే యని అనుకొనవచ్చునగాని, యీ భాషలలోని “అం” అనునది

ధాతువువైతేరిన నామవాచక చిహ్నమేమోగాని విభక్తి చిహ్నముకాదు. తెలుగులోని తత్సమశబ్దములలోగూడ నీ ము వర్ణాంతరూపమువైతే ద్వితీయాది విభక్తి చిహ్నములు. రెండు వచనములందునుగూడ చేర్పబడుచున్నవి. మాడుడు - వనము-వనముచేత-వనముల చేత, వనమునందు-వనములయందు మున్నగునవి. తమిళమున “మరం” శబ్దమువీడనైనను జాపవిభక్తిక “అత్తు” శబ్దము చేర్పబడుటచే తుది మ కారమునకు లోపముకలిగినట్లుగఁపడుచున్నది. తెలుగులో మరం-ప్రూను అయినది. బహువచనము తమిళమునందువలెనే (మరంగల్)-ప్రూంతులు. కాని కన్నడమున మాత్రము ఏకవచనము-మరమ్, బహువచనము-మరగల్. ఇచ్చట మకార లోపముకలిగినది. కావుననే కన్నడ వైయాకరణులు అమ్ - అన్న - అనువానిని ప్రథమావిభక్తి ప్రత్యయముగా గ్రహించుట తటస్థించినది. ఏమైనను ఇది ప్రథమాచిహ్నమని మాత్రము చెప్పట కవకాశములేదు. తెలుగులోగూడ నిట్లేమనేకములగు తత్సమ శబ్దములు “అమ్మం” తములగుట తటస్థించుటచేతనే తెలుగు వైయాకరణులుగూడ నాపదముల తుదిని గలుగు “ము” వర్ణమును విడదీసి ప్రథమావిభక్తిక్రింద జేర్చినారు. ఇట్టివే మరికొన్ని చేర్చుటచే తెలుగులో “డు, ము, వు, లు ప్రథమావిభక్తి” అనునూత్ర మొక పేర్పడినది. సంస్కృతభాషా మర్యాద దృష్టిలో జూచినచో, తద్వ్యాకరణ సంప్రదాయముల కలవాటుపడిన వారికి ప్రథమావిభక్తికి ప్రత్యయములు లేకపోవు లేమి అనుప్రశ్ని బాధింపవచ్చును. కాని ద్రావిడభాషల స్వరూప తత్వమును పరికిలంపగడంగినపు డా దృష్టిని కొంతమరల్చు కొనవలసియుండును. తెలుగులో “వు” అనునది కూడ ప్రథమాప్రత్యయమైనది. కన్నడములోగూడ “వు” కనబడును. కాని ఇది “మరమ్” మొదలగువానిలోని “మ”కారము “వ”కారముగా మారుటచే నేర్పడినదే. తమిళములో-మరమ్, కన్నడములో-మరవు. తెలుగులో నీ “వు” అనునది ఉకారాంత, ఓకారాంత సంస్కృత శబ్దములు తెలుగులోనికివచ్చినపుడు గలిగినమార్పునుబట్టి యేర్పడినట్లున్నది. గురు, తరు, వంటి శబ్దములు తెలుగులో నూతగా తుది నొక ఉకారమును గ్రహించి గురు-ఉ, తరు-ఉ కాగా నడుమ విసంధిని పోగొట్టుటకునుచ్చారణ సౌకర్యమునకు నొక వకారముచేరగా “గురువు, తరువు, గోవు” మొదలగు శబ్దములేర్పడినవి. ఈ “వు” ప్రథమా చిహ్నమేయైనచో ద్వితీయాదులలో లోపించి గురుచేత-గురులచేత, గురువలన ఇత్యాది రూపములు కావలసినదేగదా. కాని గురువుచేత, గురువులచేత అనియే భాషలో వ్యవహారము. కావున ఈ “వు” అనునది యెట్లువచ్చినను శబ్దగతమేగాని ప్రథమాచిహ్నముకాదు.

ఇక “డు” ప్రత్యయము నట్టిదే. ఇది విశేషముగా ఆ కారాంత తత్సమపుల్లింగ శబ్దములలో గనబడుచుండును-రాముడు, భీముడు, నూర్యుడు, చంద్రుడు. కొన్ని దేశ్య శబ్దములలోగూడ గానవచ్చును- మగడు, వాడు. దీని పూర్వ చరిత్ర కొంత త్రవ్వినగాని దీని స్వరూపము బోధపడదు. వైయాకరణులు దీనిని జిత్తుచేసి బిందుపూర్వకత్వమును విధించినారు. అనగా “ండు”దాని వెనుకటి రూపమన్నమాట. సంస్కృత శబ్దములు రామ,

భీమ, చంద్ర మొదలగునవి తెలుగులోనికి వచ్చునప్పుడు ఆ భాషకు సంబంధింప నట్టిది, ఉచ్చారణార్థము వచ్చిచేరినదని చెప్పబడిన అవకాశములేనిది అగు “ండు” వచ్చి చేరుట అశ్చర్యముగా దోషకపోదుగదా. కావున నిది దేశ్యశబ్దముల సామ్యమున వచ్చియుండ వలెను. ఇట్టి దేశ్యశబ్దములును ఈ భాషలో చాల తక్కువే. “మగడు” అనునది ప్రసిద్ధము. దీని కితర ద్రావిడ భాషలలో “మగ్గ” అను రూపముకలదు. అక్కడలేని “డు” ఇక్కడమాత్ర మెందుకువచ్చినది అనిప్రశ్న. “మగ్గ” అనుదానిలోని తుది నకారపాల్లు సామాన్యముగా నితరశబ్దములలోగనబడు దంత్యనకారముకాదు. దంత మూలములను నాలుక కొన తాకుటచే బయలుదేరు మఱియొక “వర్తన్య” నకారము. దీనికి తమిళభాషలో ప్రత్యేకసంజ్ఞకలదు. దీనికిని ద్రావిడభాషల కొక ప్రత్యేకవర్ణముగా గ్రహింపబడు శకటరేఫమునకును స్థానాంతరతమ్యముకలదు. కావున “మగ్గ” మొదలగు శబ్దములలో తుదినకారముపై నూత (accent) పడినపుడు, దీని కూతగా నీశకటరేఫ బయలుదేరును. కావున “మగ్గ” అనునది-మగన్టు, కాగా, తరువాతనీ “ఱ” కారము డకారముగామారి క్రమపరిణామముచే మగన్టు-“మగన్డు” మగన్డు-మగండు-మగడు. అనురూపము వాడుకలోనికివచ్చినది. నన్నియకు పూర్వమందలి ప్రాచీనతెలుగు కాసనముల లోనీ శబ్దము “మగన్టు” అని వ్రాయబడియుండుటయే దీనికి నిదర్శనము\* దేశ్యశబ్దములలో ప్రధానమని చెప్పదగిన “అవక్” అను పులింగ సర్వనామ శబ్దములోగూడ నీపరిణామము కనబడుచున్నది. “అవక్”-అవన్టు-వర్ణ వ్యత్యయముచే వాన్టు-వాన్డు-వాన్డు-వాండు-వాడు, అన్నంతమగు నీసర్వనామ శబ్దముయొక్క పరిణత రూపసామ్యమే, తత్సను శబ్దము లనేకములు డు మంతములగుటకు హేతువైయుండును. ఆ సర్వనామ శబ్దమునందలి “డు” అనుదానిని పులింగ చిహ్నముగా గ్రహించి సంస్కృత ప్రాతిపదికలపై జేర్చి యుండురు. లేదా, అవక్, మగ్గ-మొదలగు దేశ్యశబ్దముల సామ్యముచే, రామ, భీమ మొదలగు సంస్కృత ప్రాతిపదికలకుగూడ “అక్” చేర్చుటచే రామక్, భీమక్ మొదలగు రూపములేర్పడి, వానినుండి క్రమపరిణామముచే రాముండు, భీముండు మొదలగు నవేర్పడియుండవచ్చును. ఎట్లైనను ఇది సహజముగ శబ్దగతమేగాని విభక్తిచిహ్నముకాదు. ద్వితీయాదులలో నీడుమంతములవైవచ్చు నిగాగమముకూడ అన్నంతముపై విశేషణత్వద్యోతకముగా జేర్పబడు జౌపవిభక్తిక “ఇ”కారము మాత్రమేగాని వేరుకాదు. రామక్ + ఇ = రామని-రాముని, రామునిచేత, రామునివలన etc. ఈ సంప్రదాయమే “అక్” అనునది “డు”ప్రత్యయముగా మారినతరువాతగూడ అనుసరింపబడుచునేయున్నది. వ్యావహారికభాషలో రాముడిచేత, రాముడివలన, రాముడికి etc. “అవక్” అను రూపముపై జౌపవిభక్తిక

\*ఈ ‘ఱ’ కారస్థానమున డ కారమునుబోలి నమరి యొకవర్ణము వ్రాయబడి యుండుటయు గానవచ్చును.

“ఇ” కారము చేర్చగా అవక + ఇ = అవని > వాని అయినది. ఇది ప్రాచీనము గ్రాంథికము వాని - వానిచేత - etc. అవక - అవణ్ణు-వాణ్ణు-వాడు అయినపిదప, దీనిపై “ఇ” కారము చేరుటచే, వాడి - వాడి + ని = వాడిని > వాణ్ణి; \* వాడిచేత, వాడివలన etc. అని కూడ వ్యాకరణిక రూపము లేర్పడినవి. ఇచ్చట ‘ని’ అనునదే ద్వితీయా ప్రత్యయముగా గ్రహింప బడినది.

ఇక “లు”. అనునది బహువచన చిహ్నము. కాని ప్రథమా ప్రత్యయముకాదు. ప్రథమా బహువచనమున “లు” అను రూపము (రాములు, వనములు, అక్కలు, తల్లులు etc.) ద్వితీయాది విభక్తులలో “ల” అను రూపమున నగపదమందుటచేత వైయాకరణబలీ రెండును భిన్నములనియు ఈ భేదము విభక్తిభేదనూచకమనియు దలంచి యుందురు. కాని అన్ని విభక్తులలోను “లు” అనునదే బహువచన చిహ్నమగుట సమానమే కాని ప్రథమేతర విభక్తులలో ఏకవచనమున నామవాచకశబ్దమును విశేషణముగా జేయుటకు “ఇ” కారము చేర్చబడినట్లే (cf. రామక + ఇ = రాముని) బహువచనమున రాములు అను దానికి విశేషణత్వము కల్పించుటకు “అ” అను చిహ్నము చేర్చబడినది. రాములు + చేత = రాములు + అ + చేత, రాములచేత.

ఈ “లు” అను బహువచన చిహ్నము నీభాషలో ప్రాచీనభాషా రూపముల యనుచిత విభాగముచే నేర్పడినది. ప్రాచీన భాషలో “కల్” అనునది బహువచన చిహ్నము. ఇది తమిళ కన్నడాదులలో నిష్పటికి నారూపముననే యున్నది. ఇది అమ హచ్చబ్దములపైని మాత్రమే తొలుత చేరుచువచ్చినట్లగపడును.\* ఎలి + కల్ = ఎలిగల్, మరం + కల్ = మరంగల్, etc. ఈ శబ్దములు తెలుగుదేశ వ్యవహారములో ఎలికళు = ఎలి కలు, ఎలకలు = ఎలక - లు అనియు, మరంగల్ - మ్రాంగళు > మ్రాంకులు - మ్రాంకులు అని కాగా నీ రీతిగా కల్ లోని క వ్యమును ప్రాతిపదికతో జేర్చి - “లు” అను దానిని బహు వచన ప్రత్యయముగా పిడచియుటచే, “లు” అనునది ప్రత్యేక బహువచన ప్రత్యయమైనది. ప్రాచీనభాషలో కల్ వలెనే, యిదియు తరువాత తెనుగున మహదమ హచ్చబ్ద సాధారణముగు బహువచన ప్రత్యయమైనది. కావుననే త. అవ్వల్ - దేవర్గల్ అనునట్లు - వారలు, దేవతలు, పురుషులు మొదలగు శబ్దములపై జేరుచు నిది తెనుగున ప్రధానమగు బహువచన ప్రత్యయమగుట తటస్థించినది.

దీనిని బట్టి యీ భాషలలో ప్రథమ యొక విభక్తికాదనియు, నామవాచకమే లేదా, ప్రాతిపదికమే ప్రథమయనియు, ఈ ప్రాతిపదికపైనేగాని, లేదా దీనిపై విశేష

\* కల్ ఒడు శివణం అవ్వియర్ పెయరే కల్ వటి ఉడయ పలవటికొక్కే.

(తొల్కాపియం)

ణత్వద్యోతక చిహ్నములను జేర్చిపెడిపగాని, ద్వితీయాది విభక్తి చిహ్నములు చేర్చబడు ననియు స్పష్టమగుచున్నది. డుముపులు ప్రథమయను నూత్రము కేవల సంస్కృతభాషా వ్యాకరణ మర్యాద ననుసరించి చేయబడినదేగాని ద్రావిడభాషా సంప్రదాయ సిద్ధము కాదని దీనివలన తెలియవచ్చుచున్నది.

ఇక ప్రథమేతర విభక్త్యర్థములు ప్రాతిపదికవైగాని దాని వ్యక్తివిభక్తి రూపములపై అనగా ఔపవిభక్తికము చేరిన ప్రాతిపదికవైగాని నిలుపబడిన తత్తదగ్రభోధకములగు ప్రత్యేక శబ్దముల మూలమున నూచింపబడుచుండు ననిగదా చెప్పబడినది. అది యెట్లో పరిశీలింతము. అక్కతోడ, కత్తిచేత, అన్నవలన, తలమీద, ఇత్యాది దేశ్యశబ్దములలోనే గాక, హరియందు, మాతవలన, వనమునందు మొదలగు లిప్తములలోగూడ ప్రథమేతర విభక్తి ప్రత్యయములు ప్రాతిపదికముపై నెట్టిమార్పును లేకయే చేర్చబడును. డుమంత ములును య, ర, అ, ల, డ, ట, ి, న మొదలగునవి అంతచుందుగల ఔపవిభక్తిక శబ్ద ములునే ఇ, ఆ మొదలగు చిహ్నములను గ్రహించి వ్యక్తిరూపములుగా మారి, తక్కిన విభక్త్యర్థద్యోతక చిహ్నములను గ్రహించుచున్నవి.

ద్వితీయాది ప్రత్యయములు.

తెనుగున ద్వితీయాదివిభక్తి చిహ్నములు ని, ను, ల కూర్చి, గుఱించి అని చెప్పుదురు. ఇందు తుది రెండును కూర్చి, గుఱించు లేదా గుఱించు ధాతువులనుండి యేర్పడిన క్త్వార్థకరూపములు. వానింగూర్చి - వాల్లగూర్చి అని ఇవి ని, ను, ల ప్రత్యయములపైని చేరుచున్నవి. వానిని లక్ష్యముచేసికొని-అను ద్వితీయాధ్యమ నింకను సువ్యక్తము చేయుటకు గా నీ క్త్వార్థక రూపములు వానిపై జేర్చబడియుండును. ఇక “ల” అనునది “లు” అను బహువచన ప్రత్యయముపై విశేషణత్వద్యోతకమగు “ఱ” చేరగా నేర్పడిన రూపమని యిది వరకే గ్రహించినాము. ద్వితీయలో దీనిపై “ను” చేరుచున్నది. రాములను, అన్నలను etc. ఇట్లు “ను” అనునదే ప్రధానముగా ద్వితీయా ప్రత్యయమనియు, ఇది ఇకారాంత ప్రాతిపది కలపై జేరినపుడు “ని” గా మారుచున్నదనియు తలంపవలసి యున్నది. హరి-హరిని. ఇక ను అనునది మాత్రమెట్లు ద్వితీయా చిహ్నమైనది అనిప్రశ్న. ఇదియే స్వతంత్ర శబ్దముయొక్క యవశ్యభాగ మనిచెప్పటకును అవకాశము కలుగుటలేదు. తమిళమునందు వి, ఆ, అనియు కన్నడమున అమ్, అన్ను, తుళులో తెలుగునందువలె “ను” అనియుండుటచేత “అమ్” “అణ్” అనునదే ద్వితీయా చిహ్నముయొక్క ప్రాచీన రూపమై యుండునని కార్త్యాయో పండితుడు తలంచియున్నాడు. ఈ ద్రావిడ భాషలలో సామాన్యముగా నమహత్తులలో ద్వితీయకు బదులు ప్రథమయే ప్రయోగించు నలవాటుకలదు. వాడుఅన్నము తినును. నీవు పనిచేయుము. వాడు చెట్టు కొట్టివేసిను. ఇత్యాదులయందు ద్వితీయా చిహ్నములేదు. మహత్తులలో మాత్రము తప్పదు. వాడు చూచెను, నేను వానిని జూచితిని.

“నేను కొట్టితిని, వాడు నన్నుకొట్టెను, నిన్నుకొట్టెను” ఇత్యాది ప్రయోగములనుబట్టి చూడ నీద్వితీయాచిన్న మగు‘ను’ సర్వనామ శబ్దములలోని ద్వితీయారూపముల సామ్యమున మహచ్చబ్దములలో తొలుతనేర్పడినదా యని యూహింపదగియున్నది. నాక, నేను - నన్ను; తాక, తన - తన్ను; - నీవు-నిన్ను వీనిలోని “ను” అనునదే ఆరూపముల సామ్యమున (analogy) ఇతర శబ్దములనైగూడ జేరినను జేరియుండవచ్చును. లేదా ఇది స్థలవాచకములు సప్తమ్యర్థద్యోతకములు నగు ఇల్, ఉల్, అనువానికి సంబంధించిన ఇన్, ఉన్, అనువాని రూపమైన గావచ్చును. మొత్తముమీద నీభాషలలో ద్వితీయావస్థలు చెందును వీనికి గొంతవరకు బ్రత్యయంతత్వి మాపాదించునట్టివిగా నున్నవి. ఆంధ్ర వైయాకరణులు కి, కు ప్రత్యయములను షష్ఠిగా పరిగణించినారు. వాస్తవముగా నివి చతుర్థ్యమును అనగా సంప్రదానార్థమును నూచించును. సంప్రదానార్థము వీనివలన సువ్యక్తము కాకపోవుటచే గాబోలు కయి, కొఱకు అనునవి చతుర్థిప్రత్యయములుగా గ్రహింప బడినవి. ఇవియు “కు” ప్రత్యయముపై “అగు” ధాతువు ద్వాక్ రూపమును చేర్చుట చేతను, ప్రయోజనము అను అర్థముగల “కొఱ” శబ్దముపై “కు” చేర్చుటవలన నేర్పడినవే. కావున “కు” అనుదానికి ఇచ్చుట సాధారణముకలదు. ఇది తమిళమునగూడ “కు” అని యే కలదు. కన్నడమున కె. క. అను రూపము నొందినది. ఇది యే మూలశబ్దముయొక్క యవశిష్టభాగమో తెలిసికొనుట కవకాశములేని ప్రత్యయములలో నొకటిగా బరిగణింప బడినది. కాని ఇది సంప్రదానార్థమును దెలుపున దగుటచేతను, కొన్ని రూపములలో నిది “అకు” అను రూపముతో గోచరించుచుండుటచేతను (cf. రామునకు, గురువునకు) “విప్రునకు గోవునిచ్చుచున్నాడు” అను సంప్రదానార్థమునకు దగినట్లుగా “విప్రు (నిది) అగు నట్లుగా గోవునిచ్చుచున్నాడు” అను నర్థము నూచించుటకే “అ” ధాతురూపమగు “అగు” అనుదానినిజేర్చి ప్రాచీనులు వ్యవహరించి యుందురేమోయని యూహింపవచ్చును. కావున నిది అగు అనుదాని యవశిష్ట రూపము కావచ్చునని తలంపదగియున్నది. అన్ని భాషలలోను చిరకాలమునుండి యిది కు, గు, కె, కె అనురూపములనే బొందియుండుటచే దీని మూలరూపము కనుగొనుట కవియు నెట్లును దోడ్పడుటలేదు. కాని యిది బెంగాలి ‘కె’ హిందీ ‘కా’ అను వానినుండి యేర్పడినదికాదు. అవి సం. “కృతే” అనువానికి సంబంధించినవిగా జెప్పదగు. కాని ద్రావిడ భాషలలోని ‘కె’ అనునది వానికంటె నతి ప్రాచీన మనవలసి యున్నది.

కయి-(కు + అయి) కొఱకు (కొఱ - కు) వలెనే, కోసము-కోసరము (కు + ఓసరము) అను సర్వాచీనరూప మొకటికూడ కలదు. కన్నడమున నిచ్చి ‘కోస్కర’ అను రూపము గలదై యున్నది. ఇదియు ‘కు’ అనుదానికి ఓస్కర - ఓసుగర (=Cause, reason, sākṣa) అను శబ్దమును జేర్చుటవలన నేర్పడినదే. ఇది ‘ఓసర’ (=to bend towards) శబ్దమునకు సంబంధించినదియు గావచ్చును. ఈ చతుర్థ్యర్థమున “పొంటెకొ” అను నవ్యయ



మొకటికూడ నన్నయ కాలమునుండి వాడుకలో కలదు. “లోకహితము పొందెక”. ఇవి యన్నియుచతుర్థ్యమున జేర్పబడు ప్రత్యేక శబ్దములే.

తక్కిన తృతీయ, పంచమి, వస్తి, సప్తమ్యర్థములు సంబంధార్థమును దెలుపు లేదా విశేషణత్వమును బొందిన ప్రాతిపదికపై తత్తదర్థద్యోతకము లగు శబ్దములను నిలుపుటచే తెలుపబడుచున్నవి.

తృతీయార్థమున, చేతక, తోడక, మొదలగునవి.

కరణార్థమున - చేతక - బాణముచేత, బాణముతోడ - వాలింగూలనేసి.

హేత్వార్థము-ధనముచేత సుఖము - ఇదిచేయు ధాతువు అన్నంతరూపము.

సహార్థము - కృష్ణరాయనితో దివికేలేక. తమిళమున ఒడు, ఓడు, ఉడన్ - అనురూపములు గలవు. ఇవి ‘తోడన్’ అను దానితో సంబంధించినవే

ఇవి ‘తోడు’-(=to touch) ధాతువు నుండి యేర్పడిన రూపములు. తోడు=సహాయము, తోడు+అన్=తోడక, తోన్. కావున ‘అన్’ అనునదే తృతీయా ప్రత్యయము - ఇదియే పంచమి సప్తములలో గూడ గానవచ్చుచున్నది. చేయి, తోడు, వలన - అను వానిపై నిదిచేరుటచే నాయా రూపము లేర్పడుచున్నది. కన్న - ఇం (=ఇక-ఇల్) ఇంద. తమిళ - అక - ఆల్ - ఇది కాల నుండి యేర్పడినదని కాల్దెవ్లో ఆభిప్రాయము.

జడవాచకములమీద ‘చేసి’ తృతీయార్థమునవచ్చును. విప్రసంబోధనజేసి. ఇదిచేయు ధాతువు క్వాకరూపము.

జడవాచకములమీద తోడక అనుదానికి బదులుగా ‘మెయిక్’ వచ్చును.

భక్తి మెయిక్, నేర్పుమైక్. మెయి, మై=శరీరము. ప్రకారార్థమున బ్రయుక్తము.

తోడకు బదులు - “తోడుత” — “ప్రాణముతోడుత నున్నవాడవే”

వినయపూర్వక విద్యాస్వీకారమున “తోడ” వచ్చును. సాందీపునితోడ కృష్ణుడు వేదంబులంజదివె.” ఇది కేవలము సంస్కృత సంప్రదాయ సిద్ధము-నన్నపార్యునిచే దెనుగున బ్రనేక పెట్టబడి యుండును.

అపాదానార్థమున పంచమి యగును - - అనగా ఎడబాటు, భయము మొదలగు వాని కేదియవధి యగునో దానికి - ‘వలనక’ వచ్చుననుట. ఇది ‘వలను’=పార్శ్వము, ప్రక్క - అనుదాని అన్నంత రూపము. ఈ‘అన్’ అనునది సప్తమ్యర్థకమే కావున ప్రార్శ్వ మునందు, అని అర్థమగును. ఈయ్యర్థము నింకను సువ్యక్తము చేయవలసినపుడు దీనిపైడందు

ధాతువు క్త్వార్థకరూపముగు 'ఉండి' అనునదికూడ చేర్చబడును. "హిమగిరి వలననుండి గంగపాడమె". అన్నంతమగువలను శబ్దమక్కురలేక, కేవల సప్తమి రూపముగు అన్నంతము వైసి ఉండి చేర్చుటచేతనే పంచమ్యర్థ మొకప్పుడు వ్యక్తము చేయబడును. "వృక్షమున నుండి పగ్గము పడెను". భయాదులుగూడ అపాదానార్థములే-దొంగలవలన భయపడెను. 'వలన' లో నుచ్చారణ వేగమున నడిమి అకారము లోపించుటచే వల్లు - 'వల్ల' రూపములు గూడ నేర్పడినవి. అన్యపూర్వాది శబ్దముల సంబంధమునందు 'కంటె' అనునది వచ్చును. ఇది తరతమభావ నూచకమగు చున్నది. వానికంటె వీడు గొప్పవాడు. వానికి- అంటె=వానిని గుఱించిచెప్ప నుద్దేశించినపుడు - వానికబోల్చి చూచినపుడు - వీడు గొప్ప వాడు. అనిగాని, వాని (నీ) కంటె=వానిని చూచినపుడు వీడెగొప్పవాడు - అనిగాని యర్థము చెప్పుకొనవలసి యుండును. ఎట్లైనను ఇది ప్రత్యేక శబ్దమగుటకు సంజేహము లేదు. 'వలన'ను బ్రయోగించు కొన్ని సందర్భములలో పట్టు (=to hold) ధాతువు క్త్వార్థకరూపముగు 'పట్టి' అనునది చేర్చబడుచున్నది. జ్ఞానముంబట్టి మోక్షము. జ్ఞానము కారణముగా మోక్షము కలుగుననుట. నీమాటనుబట్టి వచ్చితిని - నీమాటను పట్టుకొని - నీమాట కారణముగా - నీమాట మూలముగా, నీవుచెప్పిన హేతువుచేత వచ్చితిని - అని ఇన్ని విధములుగా నీహేతువ్యర్థమును - పట్టి - విభక్త్యర్థమును వ్యక్తము చేయవచ్చును.

కన్నడమున నీసందర్భముననే 'కింత' అనునది ఆధునిక భాషలో ప్రయోగింపబడును ఉదా.-అదక్కింత, రామనకింత. ఇచ్చట అదక్కి, రామనగె అనుచతుర్థిపై 'ఇంత' చేర్చ బడినట్లు అగపడుచున్నది. of. రామునికి + అంటె= రామునికంటె. ఉండి అనుదానికి బదులు "ఉంచి" అని, కంటె-అనుదానికి బదులు "కన్న", పట్టి, వలన ల యర్థములందు గుండా" (జ్ఞానముగుండా మోక్షము), మొదలగునవికూడ వ్యవహారములో నున్నవి. ఇవి అంత విశేషముగా ప్రాచీన గ్రాంథికభాషలో గనబడకపోయినను - కొన్ని వ్యాకరణము లలోనికే ఎక్కినవి - (of. "ఉంచిగుండా వల్ల వలన వంకయుండేతి పంచమి" అని అధర్వ వ్యాకరణము. "ఉంచి, కన్న, పట్టి, కంటె, వల్ల, వలన, వంకోండోవో జసిసః" ఆంధ్రకాముది).

ఇట్లాయాద్యర్థములను నూచించుటకు సమర్థములగు పెన్నిశబ్దములైన ప్రాతిపది కకుజేర్చి చెప్పవచ్చును. ఈ భంగిభేదములన్నియు విభక్తులేయగును. కావుననే విభక్తులే చేయని యీభాషల విషయమున నిర్ణయింప నావశ్యకత లేదని తలంపబడినది.

తెనుగున చెట్టువలననుండి - అన్నట్లుగానే తమిళమునగూడ మరత్తి - ఇరుందు- (మర + అత్తి + ఇల్ల + ఇరుందు) చెట్టు. (ఇల్ల=ప్రదేశమున ఇరుందు=ఉండి.) అని దానికి సమానార్థములగు ఇల్ల - ఇరుందు - అనుపదములే ప్రయోగింపబడి అపాదానార్థమును నూచించుచున్నవి. కన్నడమున - మరదత్తణిం=మర + అదు + అత్తణిం =చెట్టు యొక్క-అప్రకృయందు. "వలను"కు బదులుగా "అత్తణ" ప్రయుక్తము. వస్త్రీయండి

అదునై 'అ' చేరుచున్నది - మరద. తమిళమున ఇక పై అదు చేరుచున్నది-మరత్తిరదు. ఇని ఆ, ఆదు అని మారుటయు కలదు.

వస్త్రీవిభక్తి - సంబంధార్థమును నూచించునది. 'ఇల్', 'అల్' అను స్థలవాచక శబ్దములకు రూపాంతరములగు ఇన్, అన్, అనునవిగాని, వానియవశిష్ట రూపములగు ఇ, అ, అనునవిగాని ప్రాతిపదికలవైతేరి సంబంధార్థమును నూచించు చున్నవని యిదివరకే గ్రహించియున్నాము. ఈ ఇకాల్, అకారములతో గూడి ప్రాతిపదిక విశేషణత్యమును జెందినది కాగా, దానివైని తక్కిన తృతీయా విభక్త్యర్థక శబ్దములు చేర్చబడుచు వచ్చినవి. దురుంతములవై 'ఇ' తప్పక చేరునని, సామాన్యముగా తక్కిన దేశ్యశబ్దములవై సంబంధార్థక చిహ్నమే యావశ్యకములేదని స్థానమును బట్టియే ఆ విధము నూచితమగునని గ్రహించియున్నాము కద. ఉదా. రామునిబాణము, నీతకొడుగు, తండ్రిమాట. ఈ సంబంధార్థము స్థానముచేతనే వ్యక్తమగుచుండగా ఇంకను దానిని సువ్యక్తము చేయుటకు గాబోలు "యొక్క" శబ్దముకట్టి చేర్చబడినది. రామునియొక్క బాణము, నీరయొక్క కొడుకు, తండ్రియొక్కమాట. ఇది 'సంబంధించిన' కలిపిన' అను నర్థముగల "ఒక్క" అను ధాతువునకు సంబంధించినదై యుండును. "ఒంటు" = ఇమడు, అనుకూలించు, చేరు అను నర్థములు తెలుగుననే కలవు. త. ఒంటు = to join, take shelter, ఒండు = to unite, to become one, to agree. ఒండు, ఒకటి శబ్దములు దీనికి సంబంధించినవే. తమిళమున "ఒక్క", మళ = ఒక్క, అనునవి - అన్యాయములు. "together, alongwith, in Company with, అను నర్థముగలవై యున్నవి. 'ఒంటు' నకు సంబంధించిన 'ఒక్క' కూడా తెలుగులో వ్యవహరింపబడునుండి, సంబంధార్థమును దెలుపు "ఒక్క" అను అన్యాయముగా నామవాచకములపై జేర్చబడి యుండును.

లోపలన్ అనునది 'ఉల్' - అను ప్రాచీనశబ్దమునుండి ('ఉల్' - లో, లోపు + అల్ + అన్ = లోపలన్) యేర్పడిన అన్నంతశబ్దము cf. వెలుపల, దాపల etc. కన్నడమున నది 'ఒల్' అనురూపమున సప్తమీ ప్రత్యయముగా నున్నది. ఉదా. మరదొల్, మరంకొల్. 'ఇల్' అనునది తమిళమున సప్తమీ ప్రత్యయముగా నున్నది. ఉదా. మరత్తిల్, మరత్తినిల్. లో, లోపల, అనునవికూడ స్థలవాచకములు. సప్తమ్యర్థమును దెలుపునవేకాని, నిర్ధారణార్థమును దెలుపుటకుగా బ్రయోగింపబడుటచే, సంస్కృత మర్యాదనుబట్టి వైయాకరణులచే వస్త్రీలో జేర్చబడినవి.

ఇక సప్తమ్యర్థమున 'అల్' శబ్దరూపముగు "అన్" అనునది ప్రత్యయమైనది. తుది నకారమున కూతగా నొక 'ద' కారము బయలుదేరుటచేత గావలయును అక - 'అందు' అనురూపమునుగూడ బొందినది. అట్లే ఇల్ - ఇన్ - ఇందు. 'అన్' వర్ణ వ్యత్యయముచే 'న' కూడనైనది. కావున అన్, అందు, న, అనునవి మూడును తెలుగున సప్తమీ విభక్తి ప్రత్యయములైనవి. ఇవియన్నియు స్థలవాచకమగు 'అల్'కి సంబంధించినవే.

అధునిక కన్నడమున సప్తమి ప్రత్యయముగా నేర్పడిన 'అల్లి' (of. మరదల్లి) అనునది కూడ నీ 'అల్' అనుదానినుండి యేర్పడినదే. ఈభాషలో 'ఉల్' రూపాంతరమగు "ఒల్" అనునదికూడ సప్తమివిభక్తి ప్రత్యయమైనది. తెలుగులో నీ అన్నంతమగుశబ్దము తృతీయాశ్రయమును హేత్వర్థమునుగూడ దెలుపుచున్నది. దీనిపై 'చేసి' అనుదానిని చేర్చుట యుగలదు. "దానన్ జేసి". ఇట్లే 'జన్' అనునది తృతీయా, పంచమి, సప్తమ్యర్థములను నూచించునదైనది.

అది - అను శబ్దమునుండి విశేషణ రూపము దాని అయినది. ఇట్లే - ఇల్లు - ఇంటి. వీరిపై 'అన్' చేర్చగా 'గాన్', ఇంటిక; అందు చేర్చగా - ఇంటియందు; లోపల - ఇంటిలోపల, ఇంటిలోన్, ఇంటిలోన, ఇంటివలన; ఇట్టివన్నియు విభక్త్యర్థ ప్రత్యయములుగా గ్రహింపబడినవి. ఇట్టిశబ్దముల ననేకముల నింకను జేర్చవచ్చును. ఇంటిమొపల, ఇంటిమీద, ఇంటిక్రింద, ఇంటివరుట - ఇవన్నియు సభికరణార్థ భేదములనే నూచించు నవి గనుక సప్తమ్యర్థ ప్రత్యయములే కావచ్చును. తమిళమున తొల్కాప్పియర్ 'కణ్' అనుదానిని సప్తమి ప్రత్యయముగా గ్రహించి, దీనిని 'కాల్' పునం, అగం, ఉల్, ఉత్తి కీట్, మేల్, పిక్, ముక్ మొదలగువాని యగ్రమున ప్రయోగింపనగునని చెప్పి యున్నాడు. కొందరి శబ్దములను సప్తమివిభక్తి ప్రత్యయములుగానే గ్రహించియున్నారు. ఇట్లొక్కొక్క విభక్త్యర్థము నూచించుట కనేక శబ్దములుండుటయు, ఒకవిభక్తి చిహ్నముపై మఱియొకటి చేరుటయు, ఒక విభక్తికి మఱియొక విభక్తియగుటయు నాయా చిహ్నములు ప్రత్యేక శబ్దములైనగాని సాధ్యపడదుగదా. ఇదియే యీ భాషలలోని విశేషము.

ఇట్లు పరిశీలింపగా నీభాషలన్నిటిలో, ముఖ్యముగా తెలుగులో నీవిభక్తిప్రత్యయము లనబడునవి ప్రత్యేకశబ్దములే యనియు, ప్రాతిపదికపై విశేషణత్వద్యోతక చిహ్నములు లేదా శబ్దములుగాచేరిన అత్త, ఇల్, అల్, మొదలగు శబ్దములపైని జేర్చబడి తత్తద్విభక్త్యర్థములను నూచించుచున్నవని స్పష్ట మగుచున్నదిగదా. కావుననే యీభాషలు సంయుక్తపదరూపభాషలు (Agglutinative languages) అని చెప్పబడినది. ఇందలి పూర్వాపరశబ్దములకు గల సంబంధము విశేషణవిశేష్య భావరూపమై యున్నదనియు నిశ్చయింపదగి యున్నది. ఈవిశేషణవిశేష భావరూప సంబంధము నానువిభక్తి (Nominal inflexion) విషయముననేగాక క్రియావిభక్తి విషయమున (Verbal inflexion) గూడ నీభాషలలో ప్రాధాన్యము వహించి నట్లగుపడుచున్నది. ధాతుజ విశేషణ రూపములపైనే గదా క్రియావిభక్తులు చేరుచున్నది.

క్రియా విభక్తులు.

సంస్కృత భాషలో వాక్యమున క్రియాప్రాధాన్యము నిర్ణయింప బడుటచేత, వాక్యములోనియితరశబ్దము రీతియతో నెట్టి యన్వయముకలవై యేదే యర్థముల నెట్టి రూపములను బొందుచున్నవి, ఎట్టిప్రత్యయముల మూలముగా నీక్రియాన్వయిత్యము వ్యక్త

మగుచున్నది అని పరిశీలించి, యాయర్థ సంబంధములను వానిని నూచించురీతులను వ్యక్త పఱచినారు. ఇవి వీరు నిర్ణయించిన వానికంటె నింక ననేకవిధములుగా నుండుననుటకు సందేహములేదు. కాని వాని నీ యేడురీతులక్రింద సద్దివేసి వానిచిహ్నములను వ్యాకరించి చూపినారు. ఇది వాక్యమునందలి నామవాచక పదములకు క్రియతోగల సంబంధమును గూర్చినప్రక్రియ. ఇకక్రియావిభక్తి ప్రక్రియ అనగా నొక్క క్రియారూపముల నిష్పత్తి క్రమమునుగూర్చిన విచారణ మాత్రమే. సంస్కృతమున “తిజ్” ప్రత్యయము లేమూల రూపముల యవశిష్టభాగములలో, తెలిసికొనుట కాధారము లగపడకపోవుట చేతను క్రియారూపములలో నివి యనేకములగు మార్పులకులొనై మూలధాతువులతోనో, వానినై జేర్పబడిన ప్రత్యయములతోనో కలిసిపోయి వాని వానిస్వరూపమునే గుర్తుపట్టి తెలిసికొనుట కవకాళము లేకుండుటచేతను, ఈభాషలో నీతిజంత రూపప్రక్రియ విశేషముగా పెరిగి పోయినది. ద్రావిడభాషలలోని క్రియావిభక్తి అట్టి చిహ్నములతో గూడినదికాదు. ఇచ్చటి విభక్తి ప్రత్యయములు, కర్తృవాచక పదములతోడి సంబంధమును చెప్పనవి-లేదా నూచించునవి మాత్రమేగాక, వాని సాక్షాద్రూపములలో లేదా వానియవయవములలో యొప్పున్నవి. ఇవి ధాతువునై జేర్పబడిన కాలవాచక చిహ్నములనై జేర్పబడుచున్నవి. కాని సంస్కృతాద్యార్య భాషలలోవలె ధాతువునై జేరవు. ఇంతేగాక వీని స్వరూపమునగూడ పూర్వచందలి ధాత్యాదులలోని స్వరముల సామ్యముచే గలుగు మార్పులేగాని, వాని స్వరూపముగుర్తుపట్టి లేనంతటి మార్పులు సామాన్యముగా గలుగవు. తత్తత్క్రియారూపముల తుదిని నిలిచి ఉత్తమ మధ్యమపురుషలలో ఇతర కుటుంబముల భాషలలో వలెనే లింగ భేదములేదుగావున, వచన భేదమునుమాత్రము నూచించుచు, ప్రథమపురుషలో లింగ వచన భేదములను నువ్యక్తము చేయునవిగా నుండుటచేత, ఆ యాక్రియా విభక్తి రూపములను బ్రయోగించినపుడు బ్రత్యేకముగా నేను, వాడు, అది మొదలగు కర్తృవాచక సర్వనామములను ఆ క్రియల మొదట నిలుపవలసిన యావశ్యకము లేదు. మఱియు నీ క్రియా విభక్తులు సంస్కృతమునందువలె ధాతువులనైగాక, ఆధాతు రూపముల నుండి యేర్పడిన క్రియా విశేషణములనై జేర్పబడుచున్నవి. చేయుచున్న + వాడు = చేయుచున్నవాడు - చేయుచున్నాడు. త. శైగింద్ర + ఏన్ = శైగింద్రేన్ - శైగిరేన్ ; క. మాడుత్త + ఏన్ = మాడుత్తేన్. చేసిన + వాడు = చేసినవాడు - చేసినాడు ; త. శైద + అవన్ = శైదవన్ - శైదాన్ ; క. మాడిద + ఏను = మాడిదేను. చేయు (చేయుడు) + నేను = చేయుదును ; చేయగల + ఏను = చేయగలను. చేయుచున్నాడు, చేయుచున్నది, చేయుచున్నవి అనురూపములలోని డు, ది, పి అను విభక్తులు వాడు, అది, అవి అనువాని యవయవ రూపములేయని స్పష్టము గావున నీ క్రియారూపముల ముందర మరల వాడు, అది, అవి అను సర్వనామ రూపములను నిలుపవలసిన యావశ్యకత లేదు. సంస్కృతమున “కరోతి” అనునది ప్రథమ పురుషైక వచనమును మాత్రమే వ్యక్తము చేయునగాని, అందలి లింగ భేదమును నూచింప సమర్థముకాదు కాబట్టి, సకరోతి, తత్

కఠోతి అని సర్వనామ రూపమును ముందు నిలిపినగాని తిప్రత్యయార్థము సుస్యక్తముకాదు. తెలుగులో నిట్టి చిహ్న 'ది' ప్రత్యయము విషయమున లేకపోలేదు. ఏలయుగా ఈ భాషలో నీ 'ది' అను ప్రత్యయమే స్త్రీ వాచక శబ్దములను తిర్వక్ష్ణవచకములను గూడ చూచించుచున్నది. కావుననే యీ శబ్దములన్నియు ననుమాత్తులుగా బరిగణింపబడినవి. కాని ఏక వచనమున అనుమాత్తులుగా బరిగణింపబడిన స్త్రీవాచక శబ్దముల బహువచనము మహచ్చబ్దములవలెనే 'రి' అను ప్రత్యయముచే నూచింపబడుచున్నది. అనుమాచ్ఛహు వచనమును నూచించుటకు 'వి' అను ప్రత్యయము గలదు. ఇది సర్వనామ శబ్దములలో లింగ వివక్ష విషయమునగల విశేషము. అనగా తమిళ కన్నడముల స్త్రీ పురుష వాచక శబ్దములన్నియు "ఉయర్ తిలై" అను భౌగమున జేర్పబడి, స్త్రీ వాచక శబ్దములకు 'ఆళ్' అను ఏక వచన ప్రత్యయము స్రత్యేక క్రియా రూపములలోగూడ కనబడుచుండగా, తెలుగున స్త్రీ వాచక శబ్దములకు 'అనల్' వంటి 'ఆళ్' అంత మందు గల సర్వనామ రూపము లేకుండుటేగాక, ఈ శబ్దములు జడవాచకములతోపాటు 'అట్టిజే' లేదా అనుమాత్తులలో జేర్పబడి 'అదు' అను దాని అననుమగు 'ది' అను ప్రత్యయముచేతనే క్రియారూపములలో నూచింపబడుచు వచ్చినవన్నమాట. దీనికి తగినట్లు గనే స్త్రీ 'ఆళ్' అగుటకు బదులుగా 'ఆడది' అయినది. బహువచనములలో 'రు' ప్రత్యయము పురుషులను స్త్రీలనుగూడ నూచింపనగుటచే, వారు వచ్చుచున్నారన్నపుడు వారు పురుషులు వచ్చుచున్నారని గాని, స్త్రీలు వచ్చుచున్నారనిగాని నూచించు నా శబ్దములను క్రియారూపముల ముందు నిలుపవలసి యుండును. పరిశీలింపగా క్రియారూపములలో నీ లింగ వివక్ష తొలికాలమున లేకయే యుండెననియు, కాలక్రమమున వక్తృ వివక్షాధీనముగా వాడుకలోనికి వచ్చినదనియు నూహింప దగియున్నది. ఈభాషలో నిష్పటికిని నిలిచియున్న సర్వనామ చిహ్నములే లేని "చేయును" "చేసెను" త. పోగుమ్, శెయ్యుం క. కాణ్ణం, వంటి క్రియారూపములుగూడ నీ యూహను బలపరుపగలవు. వీరికుడ సర్వనామ చిహ్నములేదు. వాడుచేయును, ఆమెచేయును, అదిచేయును. కాని బహువచనమున "వారుచేయుదురు" అనిమాత్రము కలదు. ఈ క్రియారూపములలో సర్వనామ చిహ్నము లేనికాల మతిప్రాచీనకాలమై యుండును. తరువాత కాలక్రమమున నీక్రియారూపము లనబడు వానిని కల్పించుటలో నీభాషలను వ్యవహరించినవారి దృక్పథము లో క్రియాప్రాధాన్యముకాక కర్తృప్రాధాన్యమే విశేషముగా భాసించినది. కావుననే ఈ క్రియారూపములు చాలవరకు తత్తత్కాలనూచక క్రియాజన్య విశేషణములనై జేర్పబడిన సర్వనామరూపములు గలవైయున్నవి. అనగా వ్యాపారమును నూచించుధాతువు, దానిపై జేరినకాలవాచక చిహ్నము ఇదియంతయుగూడి తరువాతి సర్వనామమునకు విశేషణమగుచున్నదన్నమాట. చేయువాడు, చేస్తు(ఉన్న)వాడు-చేస్తాడు, వచ్చెడివాడు - వచ్చేవాడు, వచ్చుచు ఉన్నవాడు- వచ్చుచున్నాడు; వచ్చినవాడు - వచ్చాడు, వచ్చు - వాడు-వస్తుడు మొదలగునవిన్నియు 'వాడు' అను సర్వనామరూపమునకు విశేషణములేకదా. తమిళ

కన్నడములందలి యీ రూపములు గమనింపదగినవి. త. శెయ్వాన్, త. శెయ్వాన్ (=చేయు వాడు) క. మాడుత్తానె=మాడు త్త (వర్తమాన క్రియావిశేషణము) + అన్. తె. చేన్తా + (ఉన్న) వాడు. త. శెయ్వాన్. (శెయ్వాన్ + అన్) క. శెయ్వాన్. (శెయ్వాన్ + అన్), మాడిదం (మాడిద + అన్) cf. తె. చేసి (ద=)న + వాడు=చేసినాడు. ఇట్లే -చేసిన + నేను=చేసినాను. చేసిన + ఈవు=చేసినావు, చేసిన + అది=చేసినది. etc.

దీనినిబట్టి యీభాషలలో క్రియాపదరూపములలో తుది సర్వనామమునకే ప్రాధాన్యమును, దానికి పూర్వమునగల ధాతువిశిష్ట భౌగమంతయు నాసర్వనామమునకు విశేషణము నగుచున్నదని తెలియుచున్నది. కావుననే మరల నేను, వాడు, అది అని సర్వనామరూపముల నీ క్రియాపదములముందు చేర్చునావశ్యకత లేకపోవుచున్నది.

వాక్యములలో చిట్టచివర నిలుచునది సర్వనామరూపమేమైనపుడు ఆవాక్యము నకు ప్రథమాంత క్వాబోధయే చెప్పవలసియుండును. తుది యీ సర్వనామ స్వరూపము సంస్కృతమునందలి 'అభూత్, ఏధ', మొదలగు రూపములలోవలె ధాతురూపముతోకలిసి యంతరించి పోయి: ప్పడు, ఆరూపమున కంటకు క్రియాపదమని, తిజాదులు క్రియా విభక్తులని చెప్పవలసి వచ్చునుగాని, 'చేయుచున్నవాడు' అని వాక్యమున సర్వనామ ప్రాధాన్యముగలిగిన భాషలలో "క్రియాపద" మనునదిగాని, క్రియావిభక్తియనునది గాని లేదనియే చెప్పినను సమంజసముగా గనబడకపోదు. సంస్కృతవ్యాకరణ మర్యాదనుబట్టి ఆ యలవాటునుబట్టి ఆవశ్యకమైనట్లే యిప్పుడు మన కది కనబడుచుండును.

ఈభాషలలో క్రియాపదముతుదిని సర్వనామరూపములు లేకయే వ్యవహారము జరిగినకాలముకూడ నున్నట్లగపడు చున్నది. తమిళ కన్నడములలో గుంతుమంత రూపములు— 'శెయ్గుం, శెయ్గు' మొదలగునవియు, అట్లే తెయ్గున పోవును, పోయెడును, మొదలగు తద్దర్మార్థక రూపములును లింగవచన భేదమేగాక కాలభేదముకూడ లేకయే ప్రాచీన కాలమున నీ భాషలలో బ్రయోగింపబడినట్లు తెలియుచున్నది. అనగా సర్వనామ శబ్దములు లేదా క్రియావిభక్తులు చేరకయే క్రియారూపములు వ్యవహరింపబడి వచ్చుట. అతిప్రాచీనకాలములో ధాతురూపములును, అర్థభేదమును నూచించుటకు భిన్నధాతువుల సంయోగముచే నేర్పడిన శబ్దములును, అప్పటిజనసంఘముయొక్క భావప్రకటనకు సమర్థమైన భాషగా నుండియుండును. కాలముగడచినకొలది వారిభావములు పెరిగి \*లింగవచనకాలాది

---

\*when our attention is turned to the Dravidian languages, we find, that, while their rules respecting gender differ widely from those of Indo-European group; they are not quite identical with those of the scythian. It seems probable, however, that the particulars in which the Dravidian rules respecting gender

భేదములు భాషారూపములలో నూచింపపలసిన యావశ్యకత గలిగినపుడు, వారు అట్టివానిని భిన్న ధాతు సంయోగముచేతను, శబ్దసంయోగముచేతను వ్యక్తముచేయ యత్నించుచుండురు. ఈభాషలలో అతిప్రాచీనకాలమున నామవాచక శబ్దములలో లింగ భేదము శబ్దార్థమును బట్టియే గ్రహింప బడుచు వచ్చినది-అక్క, అన్న, తండ్రి, తల్లి, ఆవు, ఎన్న etc. ఈ భేదము వ్యక్తముచేయవలసివచ్చుచు 'ఆడ, మగ' అను లింగనూచక శబ్దములను స్త్రీ పుంసామాన్యశబ్దములకును చుట్టేర్చెడివారు. ఆడపిల్ల మగపిల్ల. శబ్దములపై ఆక (మగక)వాడు(పిల్లవాడు) మొదలగువానిని జేర్చుట యింక స్వాధీన సప్రదాయమై యుండును. \*ఇట్టి భేదచిహ్నములు. తరువాతవచ్చినవే. కావుననే వీనిని తమిళమున "పగువదం" సమానపదములని వాడుచున్నారు. ప్రాచీన తమిళభాషలో లింగనూచక ప్రత్యయముతోగూడిన శబ్దముకంటె, సాచిహ్నములేని శబ్దమునకే గౌరవమెక్కువ. దేవన్, ఇతెవన్ - అనువానికంటె, దేవు ఇరై అనువానికే గ్రాంథిక తమిళభాషలో నెక్కుడాదరము. ఈ లింగభేదమనునది, నిర్దేశవాచక సర్వనామ రూపములగు ఆ, ఈ, ఉ అనువానిపై పుంస్త్రీవాచక శబ్దములగు ఆన్, ఆల్ అనువాని జేర్చుటచే తరువాతికాలమున నేర్పడినట్లున్నది. కావున నీ భేదమే యేర్పడకయున్న కాలమున క్రియారూపములపై విభక్తిప్రత్యయములెట్లు చేరగలవు. క్రియావిభక్తి యెట్లేర్పడగలదు. ఆకాలమున ధాతువుపై క్రియాత్వమును నూచించుటకు ఆగు, ఉతు, ఇతు మొదలగు ధాత్వంతరములనుజేర్చి క్రియాసాత్వ చిహ్నముగా 'ఉమ్' చేర్చియుండురు. ఇట్లు వెట్టం, కెయ్దుం, కెయ్యుం, మొదలగు రూపములేర్పడి

differ from those of the scythian languages, and evince a tendency towards the Indo-European, are not the result of direct Sanskrit influences, of which no trace is perceptible in this department of Drv. grammar, but have risen either from the progressive mental cultivation of the Dravidians themselves, or from an inheritance of pro-Sanskrit elements.

(Comparative Grammar. page 219)

\* The peculiar Dravidian law of gender would appear to be a result of progressive intellectual and grammatical cultivation for the masculine, feminine and epicene suffixes, which form the terminations of Drv. high caste nouns, are properly fragments' of pronouns or demonstratives of the third person, as are also most of the neuter formatives. It may indeed be stated as general rule that all primitive Dravidian nouns are destitute of gender and that every noun or pronoun in which the idea of gender is formally expressed, being a compound word is necessarily of a late origin than the uncompounded primitives.

(C. Gr. P. 220.)



యుండును. కాలక్రముమున వీనికి సర్వనామరూపములను జేర్చి చేయుదును, చేయుదుము, చేయుదువు, మొదలగు పురుషవచన భేదములతోగూడిన తద్ధర్మాగ్రకము లేర్పడి యుండును. ఇంకను తరువాత కాలభేద నూచములగు ధాతువులను, క్రియావిశేష రూపములపై లింగాది భేదములనుగూడ నూచించు సర్వనామ రూపములను జేర్చుటచే సర్వనామము నకు ధాతురూపము విశేషముగా గలిగిన క్రియాపదములేర్పడుట తటస్థించినది. దీనినే మనము క్రియాపదమున్నచో సంస్కృతభాషలో తిజంతప్రక్రియా మూలమున నేర్పడిన క్రియాపదమును దానికిని, సర్వనామ విశేష్యత్వ ప్రాధాన్యమును వ్యక్తము చేయగలిగిన ద్రావిడభాషలలోని 'క్రియాపదము'ను దానికిని ఎంత భేదమున్నదో వ్యక్తముకాకపోదు.

సంస్కృత భాషావ్యాకరణసంప్రదాయ దృష్టిలో నీగ్రావిడభాషలను వ్యాకరించిన వారు తత్సంప్రదాయసిద్ధములైన సంకేతములగు నామవిభక్తి, క్రియావిభక్తి, పదము, మొదలగువాని నీభాషా రూపములతో సమన్వయించి లక్షణ మేర్పరచినను, ఈదక్షిణ దేశ భాషల సహజపరిణామరీతులను, తద్భాషాతత్త్వమును బరిశీలించినవారి కాలక్షణము వీనిపట్ల సరిగా నన్వయింప దనియు, నివి వానివలె కేవల ప్రత్యయాం తత్వస్థితిని బొందక సంయుక్తపదరూప స్థితినే యింకను నిలుపుకొని యున్నవనియు వ్యక్తము కాకపోదు. ఇట్టి విభక్తి విషయములో వలెనే యితరములగు భాషాపరిణామ రీతులలోగూడ సంస్కృతాద్యార్య భాషలకును దక్షిణ హిందూదేశభాషలకును గల భేదమును గుర్తించినచో నీభాష లార్యభాషా కుటుంబమునకు జేరినవికాక యొక ప్రత్యేకకుటుంబ ముగా నేర్పడునను విషయము స్ఫురింపక మానదు.

## CHANDASSĀRAM OF GUṆACANDRA

By

SRI M. MARIAPPA BHAT, M.A., L.T.

*Head of the Kannada Department.*

This is a short but very useful work on prosody written by a Jaina poet called Guṇacandra (c. 1650 A.D.) This is based on a manuscript deposited in the Government Oriental Library, Mysore, and published for the first time.

The work consists of five chapters dealing with the following topics: (1) Introduction and technical terms, (2) Mātrāvṛttas including the Kannada metres Ṣaṭpadis, (3) Samāvṛttas and other varṇāvṛttas, (4) miscellaneous metres and (5) Tālavṛttas.

The work is of great interest as the author, unlike previous writers on prosody, has given due recognition to Kannada metres, particularly Lāvāṇi, usually employed in folk-songs and Tālavṛttas, which form an important feature of South Indian Music.



॥೩॥

॥ ಶ್ರೀಮದುಭಯಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀರಮಣಾಯ ನಮಃ ॥

—ಗುಣಚಂದ್ರ ನಿರಚಿತಂ—

ಭಂದಸ್ವಾರಂ



— ಸಂಜ್ಞಾಪ್ರಕರಣಂ —

—ಮಂಗಳಂ—

ಶಾ || ಸುತ್ರನಾದಿ ಸುಪರ್ವರಾಜಮಕುಟೀ ಕೋಟೀ<sup>1</sup>ತಟೀ ಪ್ರಜ್ವಲ |  
ದ್ರತ್ನಾಂಶೂಚ್ಚಯನಿಮ್ಮ ಗಾಪ್ರವಿಲಸತ್ಪಾದಾಂಬುಜಾತದ್ವಯಂ ||  
ಭೈತ್ರಂ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಿಸಾಗರಪ್ರವಹದೋಳ್ ಭಕ್ತಗೈ ಕಲ್ಪಾಂಘ್ರಪಂ |  
ನೇತ್ರಾಳಿವ್ರಜಕೀಗೆ ಸಾರಸುಖಮಂ ಸಂತಾಪವಿಚ್ಛೇದಕಂ || ೧ ||

—ಕವಿಪ್ರತಿಜ್ಞೆ—

ಕಂ || ಭಂದೋವಿದ್ಯಾವನಿತಾ |  
ನಂದಂ ಬುಧತತಿಗಮಮರೆ ಯೆನ್ನಂ ಬಯಸಲ್ ||  
ಸುಂದರವೃದ್ಧಪದತತಿಯಿಂ |  
ಸಂದೇಹಂ ಬಾರದಂತೆ ಪೇಟಲ್ ಬಗೆವೆ || ೨ ||

—ಗುರುಲಕ್ಷಣಂ—

ಕಂ || ಸಿಸಾನುಸ್ವಾರಂ ದೀರ್ಘಂ |  
ಬಿನ್ನಣಸಂಯೋಗದಾದಿಯುಂ ಸವಿಸರ್ಗಂ ||

(1) ಘಟೀ (2) ಗೆಯಮ

(3) ಸಂಯುಕ್ತಾದ್ಯ(ನ್ತ)ಂ ಸಾನುಸ್ವಾರಂ ದೀರ್ಘಂ ವಿಸರ್ಗಸಂಯುಕ್ತಮ್ ||  
ವಿಜ್ಞೇಯಮಸ್ವರಂ ಗುರು ಪಾದಾಂತಸ್ಥಂ ವಿಕಲ್ಪೇನ || (ಶ್ರುತಬೋಧ)

(ಈ ಕವಿಯು ಪ್ರಾಸಿನ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಗಮನಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರಾಸಾಸ್ವರಗಳು ಸ್ವಚ್ಛಂದವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟವೆ.)

ಸನ್ನತಗುರು ಪಾದಾಂತ್ಯದೊ |

1ಳನ್ನಿಲೆ ಲಘುವರ್ಣಮಕ್ಕು ಮಿತರಂ ಲಘುವಂ

|| ೩ ||

—ಗಣಂಗಳು-ಗಣಲಕ್ಷಣಮುಂ—

ಕಂ || ಯರತ ಭಜಸ ಮನ ಗಣಗಳ್ |

ನೆರೆವು ೨ಯರತಗಳುಮಾದಿಮಧ್ಯಾಂತಗಳೊಳ್ ||

ಪರಿಗತಲಘುಗಳ್ ಭಜಸಗ |

ಳಱಿ ಗುರುವಿಂ ಮೂಱುಗಲವವುಂ (ತಾಂ) ಮನಗಳ್

|| ೪ ||

—ಗಣಂಗಳು ದಾಹರಣಿ—

ಕಂ || ೩ವಿಮಲ ಸುಬೋಧಂ ಮಾಡುಗೆ |

ಹೇಮಾಭಂ ಕೈವಲ್ಯ ಸಂಭೃತಂ ವೃಷಭಂ ||

ರಮೇಶ ನಯ ಭಮತರಸಜ |

ನಾಮಕ ವರ್ಣೋತ್ಥ ಗಣಗಳೆಂಟುಂ ಪ್ರಥಿತಂ

|| ೫ ||

—೫ಗಣಗಳಧಿದೇವತೆಗಳುಂ-ಶುಭಾಶುಭಗಣಂಗಳುಂ—

ಕಂ || ೬ಲಘುವಂ ಗುರುವಂ ವರ್ಣದೊ |

ಳೊಗೆವುದು ಗುರುಮೂಱು ಮ ಗಣ ಧಾತ್ರಿಯು ಶುಭದಂ ||

ಲಘುಮೂರು ನ ಗಣ ನಾಕವು |

ಲಘುವೊದಲೊಳ್ ತೋಯ ಯ ಗಣ ಶುಭದಮಿವಕ್ಕುಂ

|| ೬ ||

7ಅದ್ಯಗುರು ಭೆ ಗಣ ಶಶಿ ಶುಭ |

ಮಧ್ಯದಿ ಲಘು ರ ಗಣಮಗ್ನಿ ಹೊಲ್ಲಮದಕ್ಕುಂ ||

ಮಧ್ಯಗುರು ಜ ಗಣ ರವಿಯುಮ |

8ವದ್ಯಂ ಕೊನೆ ಲಘುವು ತ ಗಣಮಭ್ಯಂ ಹೇಯಂ

|| ೭ ||

(1) ಳಾನಿರೆ.

(2) ಆದಿಮಧ್ಯಾವಸಾನೇಷು ಯರತಾ ಯಾಂತ್ರಿ ಲಾಘವಂ ||

ಭಜಸಾ ಗೌರವಂ ಯಾನ್ತ್ರಿ ಮನಾ ತು ಗುರುಲಾಘವಾ || (ಶ್ರುತಬೋಧ)

(3) ಹ್ರಸ್ವದೀರ್ಘಾಕ್ಷರಗಳ ಪ್ರಾಸು—ಈತನು ಗಣಗಳಿಗೆ ಉದಾಹರಣವನ್ನು “ಜಿನನು ಸುಬೋಧವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲಿ” ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥಬರುವ ವಾಕ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತೋರಿಸಿರುವನು.

(4) ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಗಣಾಕ್ಷರಗಳ ಆನುಪೂರ್ವಿಕವನ್ನನುಸರಿಸುವುದರಿಂದ ಕಂದದ ಲಕ್ಷಣವು ಕೆಟ್ಟಿದೆ.

(5) ಗಣಗಣಾಧಿದೇವತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವಲ್ಲಿ ಭಂದೋಂಬುಧಿಯನ್ನನುಸರಿಸಿರುವನು. (೧-೪೪)

(6) ವರ್ಗಪ್ರಾಸ. (7) ದೀರ್ಘ ಹ್ರಸ್ವವರ್ಗಪ್ರಾಸ. (8) ನಿಂದ್ಯಂ.

—ಮಾತ್ರಾಗಣಂಗಳ್—

1 ಅಂತ್ಯಗುರು ಸ ಗಣ ವಾಯುವು |  
ಮತ್ಯಶುಭಂ ಜಲಧಿ ಬಾಣ ಪಟ್ಟಂ ಲಘುಗಳ್ ||  
ಸ್ತುತ್ಯವು ಮಾತ್ರಾಗಣದೊಳ್ |  
ಕೃತ್ಯಾಕೃತ್ಯಗಳ ತಿಳಿದ ಕವಿಜನಮತದಿಂ || ೮ ||

—ಯತಿಲಕ್ಷಣಂ—

2 ಮುಂ ವೇಟ್ಟಿ ವಿರತಿಯೆಡೆಯೊಳ್ |  
ಪೆಂಪಿನೊಳಾಪದವು ನಿಲದೆ ಮುಂದಕೆ ಸರಿಯಲ್ ||  
ಲೋಪಂ ಬರ್ಪುದು ನಿಜದಿಂ |  
ಲೋ(ರೂ)ಪಮನಿಂ ತಿಳಿದು ರಚಿಸು ಸುರುಚಿರಕೃತಿಯಂ || ೯ ||

—ಯತಿನಿಯಮಂ—

ಗಣನಿಯಮದಿಂದೆ ಯತಿಯಂ |  
ಗಣಿಸುವರಾ ಗಣವು ಕೆಡಲು ಯತಿಯುಂ ಕಿಡುಗುಂ ||  
ಗಣಯತಿಯಿಲ್ಲದ ಕವಿತೆಯು !  
ತಣವುನುಡೀಂ ವಿಬುಧತತಿಯು ನಿಯಮಸ್ಥಳದೊಳ್ || ೧೦ ||

—ಪ್ರಾಸಲಕ್ಷಣಂ—

ಪ್ರಾಸೆಂಬುದು ಕಿವದು ಸುಕರ |  
ಪ್ರಾಸಾನುಪ್ರಾಸ ದುಷ್ಕರ ಪ್ರಾಸಾಂತ್ಯ ||  
ಪ್ರಾಸಂ ದ್ವಿಪ್ರಾಸಂ ತ್ರಿ |  
ಪ್ರಾಸಂ ಪ್ರತಿಪಾದದೊಳಗೆ ತಪ್ಪದು ನಿಯಮಂ || ೧೧ ||

— ಗದ್ಯಂ —

ಇ(ದು)ತಿ ಶ್ರೀಮದನುಪಮ ನಿತ್ಯನಿರಂಜನ ಪರಮಾತ್ಮಾರ್ಹದಾರಾಧನಾಪರಮಾನಂದ  
ಬಂಧುರ ಗುಣಚಂದ್ರ ವಿರಚಿತಮಪ್ಪ  
ಭಂ ದ ಸ್ವಾರ ದೊಳ್  
ಸಂಜ್ಞಾಪ್ರಕರಣಂ  
ಪ್ರಥಮಂ.

(1) ಬಿಂದ್ಯಬಿಂದುಪ್ರಾಸ. (2) ಬಿಂದುದೀರ್ಘಪ್ರಾಸ. (3) ವಡಿಡುಸುಕರ. (ನಾ. ಭಂ. ಪು. ೧೮, ಪದ್ಯ ೧೮, ೧೯ರಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. (ಅದರೆ ಈ ಪದ್ಯಗಳು ಪ್ರಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತಗಳು).

## ದ್ವಿ ತೀ ಯಾ ಧಿ ಕಾ ರಂ



### — ನಾತ್ರಾಚ್ಛಂದಃ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ —

ವ || ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವ ಲಕ್ಷಣಗಳಿಗೆ ಆ ಪದ್ಯಗಳೇ ಉದಾಹರಣಂಗಳಾಗಿವೆ.

ಆರ್ಯಾ || 1ಅಂಕಂ ಸಪ್ತಗಣಂ ಗೈಕಂ ಜಂ ಬರದು (ವದು) ವೋಜಗಣಮಾಗಲ್ ||  
ವೈಕಲ್ಪಂ ನಲಷಟ್ಠಂ ಸಕಲಾರ್ಯಾರ್ಥಮಿದುಮಾದ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಂ || ೧ ||

2ಆರ್ಯಾ ದ್ವಿತೀಯಲೋಕ್ತಂ ಪರದೋಳ್ ಮುಖಲಂ ತಿಳಿ ಯತಿಪದನಿಯಮಂ ||  
ಚರಮಾರ್ಥಂ ಪಂಚಮಕಂ ಸೇರಿವುದು ನಿಜದಿ ಸತ್ಯಂ ಲಂ || ೨ ||

ಗೀತಿ || 3ಆರ್ಯಾ ಪ್ರಥಮದಲೋಕ್ತಂ ಸರಿಸದೆ ನಿಲೆ ಲಕ್ಷಣಂ ದಳದ್ವಯದೋಳ್ ||  
ಪರಿಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಯತಿಶೋಭಂ ಸಾರಜ್ಞರ್ ಗೀತಿ ಯೆಂದಿದಂ ಪೇಟ್ಟರ್ || ೩ ||

### — ಕಂದ ಲಕ್ಷಣಂ —

ಕಂದಂ ತ್ರಿಶರಗಣಂ ತಾ |  
ಮೊಂದಿದ ಮಾತ್ರೆಗಳೆ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಗಣಮೊಂದಕ್ಕಂ ||  
ಒಂದನೆ ಮೂಱನೆಯಯ್ದನೆ |  
ಸಂದೇಟನೆಗಣದೆ ಜಗಣ ಬರಲದು ಕಿಡುಗುಂ || ೪ ||

(1) ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀತತ್ ಸಪ್ತಗಣಾ ಗೋಪೇತಾ ಭವತಿ ನೇಹ ವಿಷಮೇ ಜಃ ||  
ಷಷ್ಠೋಽಯಂ ನಲಘೋ ವಾ ಪ್ರಥಮೋಽರ್ಥೇ ನಿಯತಮಾರ್ಯಾಯಾಃ ||  
(ವೃತ್ತ ರ. ೨, ೧.)

(2) ಷಷ್ಠೇ ದ್ವಿತೀಯಲಾನ್ತೇ ಪರಕೇ ಮುಖಲಾಚ್ಛ ಸ ಯತಿಪದನಿಯಮಃ |  
ಚರಮೋಽರ್ಥೇ ಪಂಚಮಕೇ ತಸ್ಮಾದ್ಧಿಶ್ಚ ಭವತಿ ಷಷ್ಠೋಲಃ || ೨-೨ ||

(3) ಆರ್ಯಾಪ್ರಥಮದಲೋಕ್ತಂ ಯದಿ ಕಥಮಪಿ ಲಕ್ಷಣಂ ಭವೇದಭಯೋಃ |  
ದಳಯೋಃ ಕೃತಯತಿಶೋಭಾಂ ತಾಂ ಗೀತಿಂ ಗೀತರ್ವಾ ಭುಜಂಗೇಶಃ || ೨ ಗೀ. ೧ ||

—1ಷಟ್ಪದಿಗಳ ಲಕ್ಷಣಂ—

ಶರ ಷಟ್ಪದಿ ಮೊದ |  
 ಲೆರಡನೆ ನಾಲ್ಕನೆ |  
 ಚರಣದಿಯಯ್ದನೆ ಪಾದದೊಳಂ ||  
 ಕರಮಾತ್ರೆ ಮೂಱೊ |  
 ಳಾಱೊಳು ರವಿಗುರು |  
 ವಱು ವರಬುಧರಿಂದ ಪೇಲ್ಪುದಂ

|| ೫ ||

—ಕುಸುಮಷಟ್ಪದಿ—

ವರ ಕುಸುಮ ಷಟ್ಪದಿಗೆ |  
 ಚರಣನಾಲ್ಕರೊಳು ದಶ |  
 ಪರಿಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯಕ್ಷರಂ ಮೂಱಾಱಾಱೊಳ್ ||  
 ಚರಣದೊಳೆ ಪದಿನಯ್ದು |  
 ಸುರುಚಿರದ ವರ್ಣಮುಂ |  
 ಗುರುವೊಂದು ಬುಧಮತದಿ ನೆಹಿದಿರ್ಪುದು

|| ೬ ||

—ಭೋಗಷಟ್ಪದಿ—

೨೬ಂದನೆ ಯೆರಡನೆ ನಾಲ್ಕನೆ |  
 ಯಯ್ದನೆ ಪಾದದಿ ರವಿಮಿತ |  
 ಪಾದದ ಮಾತ್ರೆಯು ಮೂಱಾಱಾಱೊಳಂ ನೆಹಿಗುಂ ||  
 ಪದಿನೆಂಟು ಮಾತ್ರೆ ೨ಬರುವುದು |  
 ಒದಗಿರೆ ಯರತಗಣ ಮದಕೆ |  
 ಸುಂದರ ನಗಣಂ ಬರ್ಪುದು ಇದನಱುವುದು ತಾಂ || ೭ ||

(1) ಈ ಆರು ಷಟ್ಪದಿಗಳ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯ ಲಕ್ಷಣಗಳು—ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಶರಷಟ್ಪದಿಯ ಲಕ್ಷಣಮಾತ್ರ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯದೊಡನೆ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. (ಪು. ೮೦ ಪ. ೨೫೯) ಅದರೆ ಕಿಟ್ಟಲ್ ಸಾಹೇಬರು ಮುದ್ರಿಸಿರುವ—ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಆರು ಷಟ್ಪದಿಗಳ ಲಕ್ಷಣಗಳೂ ಹೇಳಿವೆ. ಇವು ಪ್ರಸ್ತುತಗಳೆಂದು ಊಹಿಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶವುಂಟು.

(2) ಈ ಲಕ್ಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಭೋಗಷಟ್ಪದಿ ಎಂಬ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯದ ಹೆಸರು ಇಲ್ಲ. (3) ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಭೋಗಕೆ ಎಂದು ಕಿದ್ದಿದರೆ ಷಟ್ಪದಿಯ ಹೆಸರು ಇದ್ದಂತಾಗುವುದು.



— ಭಾಮಿನೀಷಟ್ಪದಿ —

ಮನುಮಿತಮಾತ್ರೈ ಮೊದಲಿನೆರಡನೆ |  
 ವಿನುತ ನಾಲ್ಕಯ್ಯ ನೆಯ ಪಾದದಿ |  
 ಜನಿಸುಗಿಪ್ಪತ್ತೊಂದುಮಾತ್ರೈಯು ಮೂಱುಮಾಱುಕೊಳಂ ||  
 ಘನಗುರುವು ಬರುವುದುಂ ವರ ಭಾ |  
 ಮಿನಿ ಯ ಪಟ್ಟದಿಗೆ ಮುನಿಮತದಿಂ |  
 ಮನಗಣಗಕೊಂದಿರಲು ಭಜಸಗಣಮೊಂದುಂ ನಿತ್ಯಂ || ೮ ||

— ಪರಿವರ್ಧಿನಿಷಟ್ಪದಿ —

ಪರಿವರ್ಧಿನಿ ಪಟ್ಟದಿಯೊಳಗೊಂದನೆ |  
 ಯೆರಡನೆ ನಾಲ್ಕನೆಯಯ್ಯ ನೆ ಚರಣಂ |  
 ಪರಿಕೆಸೆ ಮಾತ್ರೈಯು ಪದಿನಾಱುಪ್ಪುದು ಬುಧಜನಮತದಿಂ ||  
 ಮೂಱುಕೊಳುಕೊಳುಕೊಳುಪ್ಪತು ನಾಲ್ಕುಂ |  
 ಗುರುವೊಂದುಂ ಬರುತಿರ್ಪುದು ನಿತ್ಯಂ |  
 ಯರತಗಣಂಗಳು ಬರದು ನಗಣಮುಂ ಬರುವುದು ಸಿದ್ಧಾಂತಂ || ೯ ||

— ವಾರ್ಧಕಷಟ್ಪದಿ —

ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತುಮಾತ್ರೈಯುಂ ವಾರ್ಧಕ ಸುಪಟ್ಟದಿಗೆ |  
 ವೊಪ್ಪುವುದುಮೇಕದ್ವಿಪಂಚ ಚತುರಂಘ್ರಿಯೊಳ್ |  
 ತಪ್ಪದೆಯೆ ನೆಲಸುವುದು ಮೂಱುಮಾಱುಪಾದದೊಳು ಮೂವತ್ತುಮಾತ್ರೈ ಗುರುವುಂ  
 ತಪ್ಪಿರುವ ಪದಗಳಂ ಸಂಕೀರ್ಣವರ್ಗದೊಳ |  
 ಗೊಪ್ಪುವಂದದಿ ಪೇಟ್ಟಿ ತಿಳಿಯಲು ಸುಖದಿ ಬುಧರು |  
 ಬಪ್ಪದಿದು ನಾಲ್ಕನೆಯ ಸುರುಚಿರಾಧ್ಯಾಯದೊಳು ಸುಪದವಿನ್ಯಾಸದೊಳಗೆ ||

— ಗದ್ಯಂ —

ಇತಿ ಶ್ರೀಮದನುಪಮ ನಿತ್ಯನಿರಂಜನ ಪರಮಾತ್ಮಾರ್ಹದಾರಾಧನಾಪರಮಾನಂದ  
 ಬಂಧುರ ಗುಣಚಂದ್ರ ನಿರಚಿತಮಪ್ಪ  
 , ಛಂ ದ ಸ್ವಾ ರ ದೊ ಳ್  
 ಮಾತ್ರಾಚ್ಛಂದಃಪ್ರಕರಣಂ  
 ದ್ವಿತೀಯಂ.

## ತೃತೀಯಾಧಿಕಾರಂ

### — ಅಕ್ಷರಚ್ಛಂದಃ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ —

ಕಂ || 1 ಸಮವಿಷಮತಾದಿ ವೃತ್ತಂ |

ಸಮನಿಸುವುದು ಕವಿಯಮತದಿನಿಪ್ಪತ್ತಾಯಂ ||

ಸಮುದಯ ಕವಿಜನ ಹೃದ್ಯಂ |

ಕಮನೀಯಾಕ್ಷರಸಮುತ್ಪನ್ನಂ ದೋ ವಿಧಿಯಂ

|| ೧ ||

ವ || ಉಕ್ತಾ, ಅತ್ಯುಕ್ತಾ, ಮಧ್ಯಾ, ಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠಾ, ಸುಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠಾ, ಗಾಯತ್ರೀ, ಉಷ್ಣಿಕ್, ಅನುಷ್ಠುಭ, ಬೃಹತೀ, ಪಂಚಮ, ತ್ರಿಷ್ಠುಪ್, ಜಗತೀ, ಅತಿಜಗತೀ, ಶಕ್ವರೀ, ಅತಿಶಕ್ವರೀ, ಅಷ್ಟಿ, ಅತ್ಯಷ್ಟಿ, ಧೃತಿ, ಅತಿಧೃತಿ, ಕೃತಿ, ಪ್ರಕೃತಿ, ಆಕೃತಿ, ವಿಕೃತಿ, ಸಂಕೃತಿ, ಅತಿಕೃತಿ, ಉತ್ಕೃತಿ.

### — ವಿಶೇಷ ಸಂಜ್ಞೆಗಳ್ —

ಕಂ || ಗುರು ಸಂಜ್ಞೆಯೊಳ್ ಗೆ ವರ್ಣಂ |

ಬರುವುದು ಲಘುಸಂಜ್ಞೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂದ ಲ ಕಾರಂ ||

2 ಅರುಹನ ನಾಮಂ ಗುರುವಿಗೆ |

ಬರುವುದು ಲಘು ವೆಂಬುವಲ್ಲಿ ಯತಿಗಳ ನಾಮಂ

|| ೨ ||

(೧) ಉಕ್ತಾಛಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ೨ ವಿಧ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಹುಟ್ಟುವುವು.

(1) ಶ್ರೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ಗಾತ್ರೀ

ವ || ಪ್ರತಿಪಾದದಲ್ಲಿಯೊಂದೊಂದು ಗುರುವಕ್ಷರವು ಬಂದರೆ ಶ್ರೀ ವೃತ್ತವೆನಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಪಾದ ಮಾತ್ರ ಬರೆದಿದೆ. ಇದರಂತೆ ಉಪಾದ ಮೂರುಪಾದಗಳೂ

(1) ಅರ್ಧ ಸಮವೃತ್ತವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ.

(2) ವೈದಿಕಮತದ ನಾಗವರ್ಮನು ಗುರುವಿಗೆ ಈಶ್ವರನ ಹೆಸರನ್ನೂ, ಲಘುವಿಗೆ ವಿಷ್ಣುವಿನ ಹೆಸರನ್ನೂ ಸಂಕೀತ ಮಾಡಿರುವನು. (ನ್ಯಾಭಂ. ೩೬) ಜೈನಮತದವನಾದ ಈತನು ಗುರುವಿಗೆ ಅರ್ಹಂತನ ಹೆಸರನ್ನೂ ಲಘುವಿಗೆ ಯತಿಗಳ ಹೆಸರನ್ನೂ ಸಂಕೀತಮಾಡಿರುವನು. (ಅರುಹಂತ. ಯತಿಗಳು. ಇವರೇ ಜೈನರಿಗೆ ಮುಖ್ಯದೈವತ.) ಆದರೆ ಈ ಸಂಜ್ಞೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಗ್ರಂಥದಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಂತಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಗುತ್ತನೆ. ಅಭ್ಯಾಸಮಾಡತಕ್ಕವರಿಗೆ ಗ್ರಂಥವು ಲಭುವಾಗಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಒಂದೊಂದೇ ಸಾಧ ಬರೆದಿದೆ ; ಲಕ್ಷಣ ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ವೃತ್ತದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ.

(೨) ಅತ್ಯುಕ್ತಾ ಎಂಬಿರಡನೆಯ ಭಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ನಾಲ್ಕು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವಹಿಂಚಿಕೆ—

(1) ಸ್ತೀವೃತ್ತಂ—1ದ್ವಿಗ್‌ಸ್ತೀ

(೩) ಮಧ್ಯಾ ಎಂಬ ಮೂರನೆಯ ಭಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಎಂಟು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವಹಿಂಚಿಕೆ—

(1) ನಾರೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮಂ ನಾರೀ<sup>೨</sup>

(2) ಮೃಗೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ರಂ ಮೃಗೀ<sup>೩</sup>

(೪) ನಾಲ್ಕನೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠಾ ಯೆಂಬ ಭಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಹದಿನಾರು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವಹಿಂಚಿಕೆ—

(1) ಕನ್ಯಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮಂಗಂ ಕನ್ಯಾ<sup>೪</sup>

(೫) ಸುಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠಾ ಯೆಂಬ ಅಯ್ದನೆಯ ಭಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಮೂವತ್ತೆರಡು ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವಹಿಂಚಿಕೆ—

(1) ಪಚ್ಚಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಭಂಗಗ ಪಚ್ಚಾ<sup>೫</sup>

(1) ನಾಗವರ್ಮ ಭಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ-ಇದಕ್ಕೆ “ಗರ್ವ” ಎಂದು ಹೆಸರಿದೆ. ಒಂದು ಹಸ್ತಲಿಖಿತ ಪ್ರತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ “ಗೇಯ” ಎಂಬ ಹೆಸರಿದೆ. ಇವಲ್ಲದೆ, ದಿಗಂತಗ, ಗಿರಿಧರ, ಎಂಬ ಮತ್ತೆರಡು ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ಹೇಳಿದೆ.

(2) ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ “ವಾಮಾಂಗ” ಎಂದೂ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು, ಪ್ರತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ಯಾಮಾಂಗ ಎಂದೂ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಇವಲ್ಲದೆ ಪ್ರವರ, ರತಾಂತ, (ಜಲಾಂತ) ಪರಮ ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿವೆ.

(3) ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಪಾವನ ವೃತ್ತವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ.

(4) ತೆಲುಗಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವೃತ್ತವಿದೆ. ನಾಗವರ್ಮಭಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ, ಸೌಂದರ (ಬಿಂಬ, ತೆಲು) ಜನೋದಯಂ (ಸುಕಾಂತಿ-ತೆ) ದೇವರಮ್ಮ, ಮೃಗನೇತ್ರ, (ದರದ) ಸುರತರು, ಕಾಮಾಂಗ (ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾ ಮೋದ್ಯವ-ಮೃದುನೇತ್ರ-ಎಂದು ಬೇರೆಬೇರೆ ಹೆಸರಿವೆ) ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿವೆ.

(5) ಸುಂದರಿ (ತೆಲು) ಪಚ್ಚಾ ಎಂದೂ ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಂಚನಮಾಲೆ ಎಂದೂ, ಇರುವುದು. ನಂದಕ, ಸನ್ನಗನೇತ್ರ, (ಪ್ರಗುಣ. ತೆ.) ತಿಲಕ (ನಂದ. ತೆ.) ಅನಂಗ, (ಸಕ್ಕಿ. ತೆ.) ಪ್ರೇಮ (ಅಂಬುಜ. ತೆ.) ಸರಸಿರುಹ ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿವೆ.

(೬) ಗಾಯತ್ರಿಯೆಂಬ ಅಱಿನೆಯ ಛಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಱುವತ್ತುನಾಲ್ಕು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವಱಿಯೊಳ್—

- (1) ತನುಮಧ್ಯಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ತಂಯಂ ತನುಮಧ್ಯಂ
- (2) ಶಶಿವದನಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಶಶಿವದನಾ ನ್ಯಂ<sup>1</sup>
- (3) ವಸುಮತೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ತಂಸಂ ವಸುಮತೀ<sup>2</sup> ||

(೭) ಉಷ್ಣಿಗಿಂಬ ಎಱಿನೆಯ ಛಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ನೂಱುಪ್ಪತ್ತೆಂಟು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವಱಿಯೊಳ್—

- (1) ಮದಲೇಖಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮಂಸಂಗಂ ಮದಲೇಖಾ<sup>3</sup> ||
- (2) ಮಧುವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮಧು ನನಗುರುಗಳ<sup>4</sup> ||
- (3) ಕುಮಾರಲಲಿತವೃತ್ತಂ—ಕುಮಾರಲಲಿತಂ ಜ್ಞಂ ||
- (4) ಹಂಸಮಾಲಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಸರಗಂ ಹಂಸಮಾಲಾ<sup>5</sup> ||

(೮) ಅನುಷ್ಟುಭಿಂಬ ಎಂಟನೆಯ ಛಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಇನ್ನೂಱ್ಪತ್ತಾವಱು ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವಱಿಯೊಳ್—

- (1) ಚಿತ್ರಪದವೃತ್ತಂ—ಚಿತ್ರಪದಾ ಭಭಗಂಗಂ ||
- (2) ವಿದ್ಯುನ್ಮಾಲಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮಂಮಂ ಗಂಗಂ ವಿದ್ಯುನ್ಮಾಲಾ ||
- (3) ಮಾಣವಕವೃತ್ತಂ—ಭಂತಲಗಂ ಮಾಣವಕಂ<sup>6</sup> ||
- (4) ಹಂಸರುತ ವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮನ್ಮಂ ಹಂಸರುತ ಗಂಗಂ<sup>7</sup> ||

(1) ಇದು ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿದೆ. (ನಾ. ಛಂ.) ಉದಾತ್ತ ಎಂದಿದೆ.

(2) ತೆಲುಗಿನಲ್ಲಿದೆ. (ನಾ. ಛಂ) ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇವಲ್ಲದೆ ಶಾಲಿನೀವಿತಾನ (ಮಾಲಿನೀವಿತಾನ) ಶಶಿ ಕಾಂತ (ಚಂದ್ರವದನಾ-ತೆ.) ವಿಚಿತ್ರ, ಕುಮುದ, (ವಸುಧಾ ತೆ.) ಕಮಳ, (ಮುಕುಳ-ಕುಮುದ ಪಾಠಾ.) ಸುಲಲಿತ ಈ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿವೆ. ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುರಚಿತ ಎಂಬುದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿದೆ.

(3) ತೆಲುಗಿನಲ್ಲಿದೆ. (ನಾ. ಛಂ) ಚಿತ್ರ ಎಂದಿದೆ, ಮಧುಮತಿ. (ತೆ.) ಹೆಚ್ಚಿದೆ.

(4) ನಾ. ಛಂ-ಸುಲಭ, (ಮದನವಿಲಸಿತ. ತೆ.)

(5) (ನಾ. ಛಂ.) ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇವಲ್ಲದೆ ಸರಲ. ಕೋಮಲ, ನರಗ (ಶಶಾಂಕವಕ್ತ್ರ) ವಿಭೂತಿ (ಸು ಸಾಮನಂ. ತೆ. ಪಾಠಾ.) ವಿನಿಮ್ನ, (ವಿರಾಮ) ಕಮಳ, ವಿಶಾಲ (ವಿಚಿತ್ರ) ಇವುಗಳು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿವೆ.

(6) ಇವಲ್ಲದೆ (ನಾ. ಛಂ-ನಲ್ಲಿ) ಸುಮಾಲೀ, ಶ್ರುತಾನಂದ ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ, ತೆಲುಗಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಫಿನಾನ್, ಸಿಂಹಲೇಖ. ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿವೆ.

(7) ತೆಲುಗಿನಲ್ಲಿದೆ.

- (5) ಸಮಾನಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ರಂ ಸಮಾನಿಕಾ<sup>1</sup> ಜಗಂ ಲ ||
- (6) ಪ್ರಮಾಣಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಪ್ರಮಾಣಿಕಾ ಜರಂ ಲಗಂ ||
- (7) ವಿತಾನವೃತ್ತಂ—ವಿತಾನಮಕ್ಕುಂ ತದನ್ಯಂ ||
- (8) ನಾರಾಚಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ನಾರಾಚಿಕಾ ತರಂ ಲಗಂ<sup>2</sup> ||
- (9) ಕಬರೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ತಂಜಂಲಗಗಳ್ ಕಬರೀ\* ||

(೯) ಬೃಹತಿಯೆಂಬ ಒಂಭತ್ತನೆಯ ಛಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಐನೂರುಹನ್ನೆರಡು ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವಱಿಂಗಳ್—

- (1) ಹಲಮುಖೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ರಂನಸಂಗಳೆ ಹಲಮುಖೀ<sup>3</sup> ||
- (2) ಭುಜಗಶಿಶುವೃತ್ತಂ—ಭುಜಗಶಿಶುವೆ ನಂನಂಮಂ<sup>4</sup> ||
- (3) ಉತ್ಸವವೃತ್ತಂ—ಭಂಭ್ರಗಳುತ್ಸವನಾಮಕಂ<sup>5</sup> ||

(೧೦) ಪಚ್ಚಾಯೆಂಬ ಹತ್ತನೆಯ ಛಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಸಾವಿರದ ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತು ಸಾಲು ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವಱಿಂಗಳ್—

- (1) ಸುಮುಖೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ಸಸಜಂ ಸುಮುಖೀ ಗುರುಶ್ರೀತಂ ||
- (2) ಪಣವವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮಂನಂಜಂಗ ಪಣವ ನಾಮಕಂ ||
- (3) ಮಯೂರಸಾರಿಣೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ರಂಜರಂ ಮಯೂರಸಾರಿಣೀಗಂ<sup>6</sup> ||
- (4) ವಿರಾಡ್ವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮಂಸಂಜಂಗಮ ವಿರಾಡಿಂಬರ್<sup>7</sup> ||
- (5) ರುಕ್ಮವತೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ಭಂಮಸಯುಕ್ತಂರುಕ್ಮವತೀಗಂ<sup>8</sup> ||
- (6) ಮತ್ತಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮತ್ತಾಜ್ಞೇಯಂ ಮಭಸಗಯುಕ್ತಂ ||
- (7) ಮನೋರಮಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ನರಜಗಂಗಳಿಂ ಮನೋರಮಾ ||
- (8) ಚಂಪಕಮಾಲಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಚಂಪಕಮಾಲಾ ಭಂಮಸಗಂಗಳ್ ||
- (9) ಮಂದಾನಿಲವೃತ್ತಂ—ಭಂಮಸಗಂ ಮಂದಾನಿಲವೃತ್ತಂ<sup>9</sup> ||
- (10) ಉಪಸ್ಥಿತಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ತಂಜಂರಗದಿಂದುಪಸ್ಥಿತಾಗಂ<sup>10</sup> ||

(1) ಸಮಾನಿ (ತೆ.) (2) ನಾರಾಚಿ ತೆ. \* ಇತರ ಛಂದಸ್ಸುಗಳಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲ. (3) ಹಲಾಯುಧ (ಶ್ರೀವಿಲಾಸಿನಿ-ಪಾ) (ಹಲಮುಖಿ-ತೆಲು.ಪಾ.) (4) ಭುಜಗಶಿಶುವೃತ್ತ, (5) ನಾ. ಛಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ಸವ, ಇವಲ್ಲದೆ ಉದಯ, ವನಜ, ವಿಸುತ, ಭದ್ರಕಮಯೂರ, ಬೃಹತಿ ಈ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿವೆ. (6) ತೆಲುಗಿ ನಲ್ಲಿದೆ. (7) ನಾ. ಛಂ. ಕಲ್ಯಾಣ ಶುದ್ಧವಿರಾಟ್ (ತೆ.) (8) ತೆಲುಗಿನಲ್ಲಿದೆ. (9) ಈ ವೃತ್ತಲಕ್ಷಣವೇ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಚಂಪಕಮಾಲೆಗೂ ರುಕ್ಮವತಿಗೂ ಇದೆ? (10) ನಾ. ಛಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಚಿತ್ರಪದ, ಮನರಂಗ, ಇವೂ, ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ರಸಾಲಿ, ಕಾಮುದೀ, ನಂದಿನಿ, ಭೋಗವಿಲಾಸಿತಂ, ಮನೋರಮ. ಈ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿವೆ.

(೧೧) ತ್ರಿಷ್ಟುಭಿಂ ಬ ಹನ್ನೊಂದನೆಯ ಛಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಎರಡುಸಾವಿರದ ಸಾಲ್ವತ್ತೆಂಟು ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಇವುಗಳೆಂದರೆ—

- (1) <sup>1</sup>ಇಂದ್ರವಜ್ರವೃತ್ತಂ—ತಾನಿಂದ್ರವಜ್ರಂ ತತಜಂಗಗಂಗಳ್ ||
- (2) ಉಪೇಂದ್ರವಜ್ರವೃತ್ತಂ—ಉಪೇಂದ್ರವಜ್ರಂ ಜತಜಂಗಗಂಗಳ್ ||
- (3) <sup>2</sup>ಉಪಜಾತಿ ವೃತ್ತಲಕ್ಷಣಂ—  
ಹನ್ನೊಂದನೇ ಛಂದದ ಪಾದವೊಂದು |  
ತಾನನ್ಯಛಂದೋಗತಪಾದಕೂಟದಿ ||  
ಮನೋಜ್ಞಮಾಗಲ್ಕುಪಜಾತಿವೃತ್ತಂ |  
ನಾನಾವಿಧಂ ಮುಂತೆಯುಮಿಂತು ಬರ್ಕುಂ ||
- (4) ಸುಮುಖೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ನಜಜಲಗಂಗಳೆ ತಾಂ ಸುಮುಖೀಃ ||
- (5) ದೋಧಕ ವೃತ್ತಂ—ದೋಧಕವೃತ್ತವೆ ಭಂಭಭಗಂಗಳ್ ||
- (6) ಶಾಲಿನೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ಶಾಲಿನ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಂ ಮಂತತಂಗದ್ವಿಯುಕ್ತಂ ||
- (7) ವಾತೋರ್ವಿವೃತ್ತಂ—ವಾತೋನ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಂ ಮುಭಭಂಗಳೆಗಂಗಳ್<sup>4</sup> ||
- (8) ಗಗನವಿಲಸಿತವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮ್ಭಂ ನಂ ಲಂಗಂ ಗಗನ ವಿಲಸಿತಂ ||
- (9) ರಥೋದ್ಧತ ವೃತ್ತಂ—ರನ್ನರಂಗಳೆ ರಥೋದ್ಧತಂ ಲಗಂ ||
- (10) ಸ್ವಾಗತವೃತ್ತಂ—ಸ್ವಾಗತಾಖ್ಯ ರನಭಂ ಗುರುಯುಗ್ಮಂ ||
- (11) ವೃತ್ತ ವೃತ್ತಂ—ನನಸಗಗುರು ರಚಿತಂ ವೃತ್ತಂ ||
- (12) ರಥಪೃಥ್ವೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ನನಭಗಗುರುಕಂ ರಥಪೃಥ್ವೀ<sup>7</sup> ||
- (13) ಭದ್ರಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ನನರಲ ಗುರುವಾಗೆ ಭದ್ರಿಕಾ<sup>8</sup> ||
- (14) ಚಿತ್ರವೃತ್ತಂ—ನನತಗ ಗುರುಗಳ್ ಚಿತ್ರವೃತ್ತಂ<sup>9</sup> ||
- (15) ಶೈಲಿನಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಶೈಲಿನಿಕಾ ರಜಂರಲಂ ಗುರುಶ್ರೀತಂ<sup>10</sup> ||
- (16) ಮೌಕ್ತಿಕಮಾಲಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮೌಕ್ತಿಕಮಾಲಾ ಭತನಗಂಗಳ್<sup>11</sup> ||
- (17) ಪಂಚಶರವೃತ್ತಂ—ಪಂಚಶರಂ ಶ್ರೀ ಭತನಗಂಗಳ್ ||
- (18) ಉಪಸ್ಥಿತವೃತ್ತಂ—ಉಪಸ್ಥಿತ ಜಸಂತಂ ಗಂಗಮಕ್ಕುಂ ||

(1) (ತ.) ಇಂದ್ರಂ. (2) ನಾಗವರ್ಮನ ಛಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಉಪಜಾತಿಯನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತವೃತ್ತರತ್ನಾಕರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದೆ.

ಅನಂತರೋದೀಂತಲಕ್ಷ ಭಾಜಾ ಪಾದಾ ಯದೀಯಾವುಪಜಾತಯಸ್ತಾಃ ||

ಇತ್ಯಂ ಕಿಲಾನ್ಯಾಸ್ತಸಿ ಮಿತ್ರತಾಸು ಭವಂತಿ ಜಾತಿಷ್ಟಿದಮೇವ ನಾಮ(ವೃತ್ತ. ಅ. 4-೧೧-೪)

(3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12) ತೆಲುಗಿನಲ್ಲಿದೆ. (5) ನಾ. ಛಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ, ಭ್ರಮರವಿಲಸಿತಂ. (8) ನಾ. ಛಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ, ಚಂದ್ರಿಕೆ. (10) ನಾ. ಛಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ, ಸೈನಿಕಂ. (11) ನಾ. ಛಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ, ಸಾಂದ್ರ

- (5) ಸಮಾನಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ರಂ ಸಮಾನಿಕಾ<sup>1</sup> ಜಗಂ ಲ ||
- (6) ಪ್ರಮಾಣಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಪ್ರಮಾಣಿಕಾ ಜರಂ ಲಗಂ ||
- (7) ವಿತಾನವೃತ್ತಂ—ವಿತಾನಮಕ್ಕುಂ ತದನ್ಯಂ ||
- (8) ನಾರಾಚಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ನಾರಾಚಿಕಾ ತರಂ ಲಗಂ<sup>2</sup> ||
- (9) ಕಬರೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ತಂಜಂಲಗಗಳ್ ಕಬರೀ\* ||

(೯) ಬೃಹತಿಯೆಂಬ ಒಂಭತ್ತನೆಯ ಛಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಐನೂರುಹನ್ನೆರಡು ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವುಗಳೆ—

- (1) ಹಲಮುಖೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ರಂಸಸಂಗಳೆ ಹಲಮುಖೀ<sup>3</sup> ||
- (2) ಭುಜಗಶಿಶುವೃತ್ತಂ—ಭುಜಗಶಿಶುವೆ ನಂಸಂಮಂ<sup>4</sup> ||
- (3) ಉತ್ಸವವೃತ್ತಂ—ಭಂಭ್ರಗಳುತ್ಸವನಾಮಕಂ<sup>5</sup> ||

(೧೦) ಸಮಾಪ್ತಿಯೆಂಬ ಹತ್ತನೆಯ ಛಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಸಾವಿರದ ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತು ನಾಲ್ಕು ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವುಗಳೆ—

- (1) ಸುಮುಖೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ಸಸಜಂ ಸುಮುಖೀ ಗುರುಶ್ರೀತಂ ||
- (2) ಪಣವವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮಂಸಂಜಂಗ ಪಣವ ನಾಮಕಂ ||
- (3) ಮಯೂರಸಾರಿಣೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ರಂಜರಂ ಮಯೂರಸಾರಿಣೀಗಂ<sup>6</sup> ||
- (4) ವಿರಾಡ್ವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮಂಸಂಜಂಗಮ ವಿರಾಡಿಂಬರ್<sup>7</sup> ||
- (5) ರುಕ್ಮವತೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ಭಂಮಸಯುಕ್ತಂ ರುಕ್ಮವತೀಗಂ<sup>8</sup> ||
- (6) ಮತ್ತಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮತ್ತಾಜ್ಞೇಯಂ ಮಭಸಗಯುಕ್ತಂ ||
- (7) ಮನೋರಮಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ನರಜಗಂಗಳಿಂ ಮನೋರಮಾ ||
- (8) ಚಂಪಕಮಾಲಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಚಂಪಕಮಾಲಾ ಭಂಮಸಗಂಗಳ್ ||
- (9) ಮಂದಾನಿಲವೃತ್ತಂ—ಭಂಮಸಗಂ ಮಂದಾನಿಲವೃತ್ತಂ<sup>9</sup> ||
- (10) ಉಪಸ್ಥಿತಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ತಂಜಂರಗದಿಂದುಪಸ್ಥಿತಾಗಂ<sup>10</sup> ||

(1) ಸಮಾನಿ (ತೆ.) (2) ನಾರಾಚ ತೆ. \* ಇತರ ಛಂದಸ್ಸುಗಳಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲ. (3) ಹಲಾಯುಧ (ಶ್ರೀವಿಲಾಸಿನಿ-ಪಾ) (ಹಲಮುಖಿ-ತೆಲು-ಪಾ.) (4) ಭುಜಗಶಿಶುವೃತ್ತ, (5) ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ಸವ, ಇವಲ್ಲದೆ ಉದಯ, ವನಜ, ವಿನುತ, ಭದ್ರಕಮಯೂರ, ಬೃಹತಿ ಈ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿವೆ. (6) ತೆಲುಗಿ ನಲ್ಲಿದೆ. (7) ನಾ. ಭಂ. ಕಲ್ಯಾಣ ಶುದ್ಧವಿರಾಟ್ (ತೆ.) (8) ತೆಲುಗಿನಲ್ಲಿದೆ. (9) ಈ ವೃತ್ತಲಕ್ಷಣವೇ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಚಂಪಕಮಾಲೆಗೂ ರುಕ್ಮವತಿಗೂ ಇದೆ? (10) ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಚಿತ್ರಪದ, ಮಣಿರಂಗ, ಇವೂ, ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ರಸಾಲಿ, ಕಾಮುದೀ, ನಂದಿನಿ, ಭೋಗವಿಲಸಿತಂ, ಮನೋರಮ. ಈ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿವೆ.

(೧೧) ತ್ರಿಷ್ಠುಭಿಂಬ ಹನ್ನೊಂದನೆಯ ಛಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಎರಡುಸಾವಿರದ ನಾಲ್ಕತ್ತೆಂಟು ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವುಗಳೆ—

- (1) 1ಇಂದ್ರವಜ್ರವೃತ್ತಂ—ತಾನಿಂದ್ರವಜ್ರಂ ತತಜಂಗಗಂಗಳ್ ||
- (2) ಉಪೇಂದ್ರವಜ್ರವೃತ್ತಂ—ಉಪೇಂದ್ರವಜ್ರಂ ಜತಜಂಗಗಂಗಳ್ ||
- (3) 2ಉಪಜಾತಿ ವೃತ್ತಲಕ್ಷಣಂ—

ಹನ್ನೊಂದನೇ ಛಂದದ ಪಾದಮೊಂದುಂ |  
ತಾನನ್ಯಭಂದೋಗತಪಾದಕೂಟದಿಂ ||  
ಮನೋಜ್ಞಮಾಗಲ್ಪುಪಜಾತಿವೃತ್ತಂ |  
ನಾನಾವಿಧಂ ಮುಂತೆಯುಮಿಂತು ಬರ್ಕುಂ ||

- (4) ಸುಮುಖೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ನಜಜಲಗಂಗಳೆ ತಾಂ ಸುಮುಖೀಃ ||
- (5) ದೋಧಕ ವೃತ್ತಂ—ದೋಧಕವೃತ್ತವೆ ಭಂಭಭಗಂಗಳ್ ||
- (6) ಶಾಲಿನೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ಶಾಲಿನ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಂ ಮಂತತಂಗದ್ವಿಯುಕ್ತಂ ||
- (7) ವಾತೋರ್ವಿವೃತ್ತಂ—ವಾತೋರ್ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಂ ಮಭಭಂಗಳೆಗಂಗಳ್ ||
- (8) ಗಗನವಿಲಸಿತವೃತ್ತಂ—ವೃಂ ನಂ ಲಂಗಂ ಗಗನ ವಿಲಸಿತಂ ||
- (9) ರಥೋದ್ಧತ ವೃತ್ತಂ—ರನ್ನರಂಗಳೆ ರಥೋದ್ಧತಂ ಲಗಂ ||
- (10) ಸ್ವಾಗತವೃತ್ತಂ—ಸ್ವಾಗತಾಖ್ಯ ರನಭಂ ಗುರುಯುಕ್ತಂ ||
- (11) ವೃತ್ತ ವೃತ್ತಂ—ನನಸಗಗುರು ರಚಿತಂ ವೃತ್ತಂ ||
- (12) ರಥಸ್ತುಧೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ನನಭಗಗುರುಕಂ ರಥಸ್ತುಧೀ ||
- (13) ಭದ್ರಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ನನರಲ ಗುರುವಾಗೆ ಭದ್ರಿಕಾ ||
- (14) ಚಿತ್ರವೃತ್ತಂ—ನನತಗ ಗುರುಗಳ್ ಚಿತ್ರವೃತ್ತಂ ||
- (15) ಶೈನಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಶೈನಿಕಾ ರಜಂರಲಂ ಗುರುಕ್ರಿತಂ ||
- (16) ಮೌಕ್ತಿಕಮಾಲಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮೌಕ್ತಿಕಮಾಲಾ ಭತನಗಂಗಳ್ ||
- (17) ಪಂಚಶರವೃತ್ತಂ—ಪಂಚಶರಂ ಶ್ರೀ ಭತನಗಂಗಳ್ ||
- (18) ಉಪಸ್ಥಿತವೃತ್ತಂ—ಉಪಸ್ಥಿತ ಜಸಂತಂ ಗಂಗಳ್ ||

(1) (ತೆ.) ಇಂದ್ರಂ. (2) ನಾಗನರ್ಮನ ಛಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಉಪಜಾತಿಯನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತವೃತ್ತರತ್ನಾಕರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದೆ.

ಅನಂತರೋದೀರಿತಲಕ್ಷ ಭಾಜಾ ಪಾದಾ ಯದೀಯಾವುಪಜಾತಯಸ್ತಾಃ ||

ಇತ್ಯಂ ಕಿಲಾನ್ಯಾಸ್ತು ಪಿ ಮಿತ್ರತಾಸ್ತು ಭವಂತಿ ಜಾತಿಷ್ಟಿದಮೇನ ನಾನು (ವೃತ್ತ. ಅ. 4-೧೧-೪)

(3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12) ತೆಲುಗಿನಲ್ಲಿವೆ. (5) ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ, ಭ್ರಮರವಿಲಸಿತಂ. (8) ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ, ಚಂದ್ರಿಕೆ. (10) ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ, ಸೈನಿಕಂ. (11) ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ, ಸಾಂದ್ರ



(19) ಸಮ್ಮತವೃತ್ತಂ—ನರಯುಗಂಗಳುಂ ಸಮ್ಮತಂ ಲಗಂ ||

(20) ಕುಮಾರೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ಯಯಂಯಂ ಲಗಂಗಳ್ ಕುಮಾರೀನೇಸರ್<sup>1</sup> ||

(೧೨) ಜಗತಿಯೆಂಬ ಹನ್ನೆರಡನೆಯ ಭಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ನಾಲ್ಕುಸಾವಿರದ ತೊಂಬತ್ತಾಯಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವುಗಳೆ—

(1) ಚಂದ್ರವರ್ತವೃತ್ತಂ—ಚಂದ್ರವರ್ತಮಿದುಮಕ್ಕು ರನಭಸಂ<sup>2</sup> ||

(2) ವಂಶಸ್ಥವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮನೋಜ್ಞ ವಂಶಸ್ಥಮಿದುಂ ಜತಂ ಜರಂ ||

(3) ಇಂದ್ರವಂಶವೃತ್ತಂ—ತಾಮಿಂದ್ರವಂಶಂ ತತಜಂ ರಸಂಯುತಂ ||

(4) ತೋಟಕವೃತ್ತಂ—ಇದು ತೋಟಕಮಂಬುಧಿಸಂಯುತಮುಂ ||

(5) ದ್ರುತವಿಲಂಬಿತವೃತ್ತಂ—ದ್ರುತವಿಲಂಬಿತನಾಮ ನಭಂಭರಂ ||

(6) ಪುಟವೃತ್ತಂ—ನನಮಯ ಗಣಸಂಯುಕ್ತಂ ಪುಟಾಖ್ಯಂ<sup>3</sup> ||

(7) ಪ್ರಮುದಿತವದನಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಪ್ರಮುದಿತವದನಾ ನನಂರಂರವುಂ<sup>4</sup> ||

(8) ಕುಸುಮವಿಚಿತ್ರವೃತ್ತಂ—ನಯನಯಯುಕ್ತಂ ಕುಸುಮವಿಚಿತ್ರಂ<sup>5</sup> ||

(9) ಜಲೋದ್ಧತಗತಿವೃತ್ತಂ—ರಸಂಜ ಸಜಸಂ ಜಲೋದ್ಧತಗತಿ ||

(10) ಭ.ಜಂಗಪ್ರಯಾತವೃತ್ತಂ—ಭುಜಂಗಪ್ರಯಾತಂ ಮತಂಯಂ ಯಯಂಯಂ

(11) ಸ್ತಗ್ವಿಣೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ರಂ ಚತುರ್ವಾರಜಂ ಸ್ತಗ್ವಿಣೀ ಸಮ್ಮತಂ ||

(12) ಪ್ರಿಯಂವದಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಸುವಿದಿತಂ ನಭಜರಂ ಪ್ರಿಯಂವದಾ<sup>6</sup> ||

(13) ಮಣಿಮಾಲಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ತ್ಯಂತ್ಯಂ ಮಣಿಮಾಲಾ ಛಿನ್ನಾಕ್ಷರಪಟ್ಟಿಂ<sup>7</sup> ||

(14) ಲಲಿತಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಲೋಕಪ್ರಥಿತಂ ಲಲಿತಾ ತಜಂಜರಂ ||

(15) ಪ್ರಮಿತಾಕ್ಷರಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಪ್ರಮಿತಾಕ್ಷರಾ ಸಜಸಂಕಥಿತಾ ||

(16) ಜ್ವಾಲಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ನನಭಮಸಹಿತಂ ವಿದಿತಂ ಜ್ವಾಲಾ ||

(17) ವೈಶ್ವದೇವೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ಅಯ್ದೇವಿಂ ಛಿನ್ನಂ ವೈಶ್ವದೇವೀ ವ್ಯುದ್ವೈತಂ<sup>8</sup> ||

(18) ಜಲಧ(ರ)ಮಾಲಾ—ಅಬ್ಧಿಷ್ಟೋಕ್ತಂ ಜಲಧ(ರ)ಮಾಲಾ ವ್ಯುತ್ಕಂ<sup>9</sup> ||

(19) ಅಭಿನವಮಾಲಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಅಭಿನವಮಾಲಿಕಾ ನಜಭಯೋಕ್ತಂ ||

(20) ಪ್ರಭಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಸ್ವರಶರಯತಿ ನಂನರಂ ರಂ ಪ್ರಭಾ ||

(1) ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಣಿಕ್ಯ ಲಯಗ್ರಾಹಿ-ಇವೂ, (ತೆ) ನಲ್ಲಿ, ಕಲಿಕಾಂತ (ಗೀತಾಲಂಬನ), ಕಾಂತಿ (ತ) ಶಿಖಂಡಿವಿತಾನ, (ಉಪಸ್ಥಿತ) ಈ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿವೆ. (2) ಚಂದ್ರಿಕೆ. (3) ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಘಟ. (4, 5, 7, 8, 9) ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿದೆ. (6) ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರುಹಮಂ ಅಥವಾ ಮತ್ತಕೋಕಿಲಂ, (ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿ) ಪ್ರಿಯಂವದ.

- (21) ಮಾನೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ನಜಜರಸಿದ್ಧವು ಮಾನೀವೃತ್ತಂ ಪೆಸರ್ ||
- (22) ಅಭಿನವತಾಮರವೃತ್ತಂ—ಅಭಿನವತಾಮರಸಂ ನಜಜಂಯಂ ||
- (23) ಗೌರೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ನಯುಗ ರಯುಗದಿಂದೆ ಗೌರೀ ಪೆಸರ್ ||
- (24) ಲಲನಾವೃತ್ತಂ—1ಪಂಚರ್ಷಿಭಗ್ನಂ ಭೃಷಯುಗಂ ಲಲನಾ ||
- (25) ಲಲಿತವೃತ್ತಂ—ಲಲಿತಮಿದು ನ ನಂಮಂರಂ ನಾಮದಿಂ ||
- (26) ಮೌಕ್ತಿಕದಾಮವೃತ್ತಂ—ಚತುರ್ಜಗಣಂಗಳೆ ಮೌಕ್ತಿಕದಾಮ ||
- (27) ಕೋರಕಿತವೃತ್ತಂ—ಸಯಸಂಗಳುಂ ಕೋರಕಿತಂ(ಯ)ಯುಕ್ತಂ2 ||

(೧೩) ಅತಿಜಗತಿಯೆಂಬ ಪದಿಮೂಜನೆಯ ಭಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಎಂಟುಸಾವಿರದ ನೂರುತೊಂಬತ್ತೆರಡು ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ—

- (1) ಚಂಚರೀಕಾವಳೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ಯಮಂ ರಂರಂ ಖ್ಯಾತಂ ಚಂಚರೀಕಾವಳೀಗಂ3
- (2) ಕ್ಷಮಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ತುರಗರಸದಿ ನಂನಂ ತತಂಗಂ ಕ್ಷಮಾ4
- (3) ಪ್ರಹರ್ಷಣೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮ್ನಂ ಜಂ ರಂ ತ್ರಿದಶ ಯತಿ ಪ್ರಹರ್ಷಣೀಗಂ5
- (4) ಮತ್ತಮಯೂರವೃತ್ತಂ—ನಾಲ್ಕೆಂಟು (ಂ) ಮಂತಂ ಯಸಗಂ ಮತ್ತಮಯೂರಂ
- (5) ರುಚಿರಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಜಭಂಸಜಂ ಗುರು ರುಚಿರಾ ಚತುರ್ಗ್ರಹಂ6
- (6) ಮಂಜುಭಾಷಿಣೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ಸಜಸಂ ಜಗಂಗಳಿವು ಮಂಜುಭಾಷಿಣೀ7
- (7) ಸರಸಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಸಜಸಂ ಸಗಂ ಸುಕಥಿತಂ ಸರಸಾಖ್ಯಂ
- (8) ಸುಮಂಗಳಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಸಜಸಂ ಸಗಂಗಳೆ ಸುಮಂಗಳಿಕಾಖ್ಯಂ8
- (9) ಪ್ರಭದ್ರಕವೃತ್ತಂ—ನಜಸಜಗಂ ಸುವಿದಿತಂ ಪ್ರಭದ್ರಕಂ9 ||

(೧೪) ಶಕ್ತರಿ ಎಂಬ ಪದಿನಾಲ್ಕನೆಯ ಭಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಹದಿನಾಲ್ಕು ಸಾವಿರದ ಮುನ್ನೂರುತೊಂಬತ್ತು ನಾಲ್ಕು ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ.

- (1) ಅಸಂಬಾಧವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮ್ರಂ ನ್ಮಂ ಗಂ ಪಂಚಗ್ರಹವಿರತಿಯಸಂ ಬಾಧಂ10 ||

(1) ಪಂಚಪಂಷಿ ಭೃಂಸಂ ಸಯುತಂ ಲಲನಾ? (2) ಕೋರಕಿತಂ, ಇವಲ್ಲದೆ ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ದ್ರುತಪದ, ಹಂಸಮತ್ತಂ. ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಜಲಧರಮಾಲ, ಮೇಘವಿಲಸಿತ, ಇವು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ. (3) 3, 4, 5, 7, 8-ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿವೆ. (6) ನಾ. ಭಂ. ರುಚಿರ. (9) ಇವಲ್ಲದೆ ಅಭ್ಯುದಯ, ಅಂಗರುಚಿ, ಸೌಂದರ, ಪ್ರಭಾತಮಿಶ್ರ, ಅಂಬುಜ ಇವು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ. (10) ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿ (ಲಕ್ಷಣಂ ಮ. ತ. ನ. ಸ. ಗಗ).

- (2) ಅಪರಾಜಿತಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ನನರಸ ಲಗಮೇಱಿಱಂದಪರಾಜಿತಾ<sup>1</sup> ||
- (3) ಇವಸಂತತಿಲಕವೃತ್ತಂ—ಪ್ರೋಕ್ತಂ ವಸಂತತಿಲಕಂ ತಭಜಂ ಜಗಂಗಂ||
- (4) ಪ್ರಹರಣತಿಲಕವೃತ್ತಂ—ನನಭನಗಲಗಳ್ ಪ್ರಹರಣ ತಿಲಕಂ<sup>2</sup> ||
- (5) ಇಂದುವದನವೃತ್ತಂ—ಇಂದುವದನಂ ಭಜನಂ ಸಗುರುಯುಗ್ಮಂ<sup>3</sup> ||
- (6) ಅಲೋಲವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮಂಸಂ ಮಂಭಗಂ ದ್ವಿಸ್ಪಪ್ತಚ್ಛೇದ ಮಲೋಲಂ||
- (7) ಕುಮಾರೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ನಜಭಜ ಗಂಗಮೆಂಟು ಮುತುವುಂ ಕುಮಾರೀ ||
- (8) ಮಂಜುಭಾಷಿಣೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ಸಜಸಂ ಜಗಂಗಳವು ಮಂಜುಭಾಷಿಣೀ||
- (9) ಸುಕೇಸರವೃತ್ತಂ—ನರನರಂಲಗಂ ಸುವಿದಿತಂ ಸುಕೇಸರಂ ||
- (10) ಮದನಾರ್ತಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಅಂತ್ಯಂಗುರುಯುಗ್ಮಂ ತಯಸಂ ಭಂ ಮದನಾರ್ತ<sup>5</sup> ||

(ಗಾ) ಅತಿಶಕ್ತರಿ ಎಂಬ ಹದಿನಯ್ದನೆಯ ಛಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಮೂವತ್ತೆರಡು ಸಾವಿರದ ಏಲ್ಲೂಱಿಱುವತ್ತೆಂಟು ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ.

- (1) ಶಶಿಕಲಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ದ್ವಿಹತ ಹಯಲ ಘುಗುರುಗಳೆ ಶಶಿಕಲಾ ||
- (2) ಸ್ರಗ್ವೃತ್ತಂ—ಸ್ರಗಭಧಮಿದು ರಸನವಕ ಯತಿಯುತಂ<sup>6</sup> ||
- (3) ಮಣಿಗುಣನಿಕರವೃತ್ತಂ—ವಸುಹಯಯತಿ ಯಿದು ಮಣಿಗುಣನಿಕರಂ ||
- (4) ಮಾಲಿನೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ನನಮಯಯ ಸಮೇತಂ ಮಾಲಿನೀ ಯೆಂಟು ಮೇಱುಂ ||
- (5) ಚಂದ್ರಲೋಖಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮಂ ರಂ ಮಂ, ಯಂ ಯಮೆಂಟುಂ ಸಸ್ತಾನ್ವಿತಂ ಚಂದ್ರರೇಖಾ<sup>7</sup> ||
- (6) ಉತ್ಸವವೃತ್ತಂ—ರಂಜರಂ ಜರಂಗಳೆಂಟಿಱಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದೊಡುತ್ತವಂ<sup>8</sup> ||

(1) ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿ. (2) ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಿಂಹೋನ್ನತ, ಔದ್ಧರ್ವಣಿ, ಶೋಭಾವತಿ, ಮಧುಮಾಧನಿ ಎಂದು ನಾಲ್ಕು ಹೆಸರುಗಳುಂಟು. (3) ನಾ. ಛಂ. ಪ್ರಹರಣಕಲಿಕ)ತ. (4) ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ವನಮಯೂರ. ನಾ. ಛಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಟ್ಟಿಲಮಯೂರ. (5) ಮತ್ತೆ ನಾ. ಛಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಸುಮಾಂಘ್ರಿಪ, ವನಮಯೂರ, ಸುಂದರ, ವಸಂತ, ಈ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ, ತೆಲುಗಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಭೂನುತ, ನವನಂದಿನಿ, ಕಮಲವಿಲಸಿತ, ಸುಂದರ ಈ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿವೆ. (6) ನ. ನ. ನ. ಸ. ಗಣಗಳ್ ಎಂದು ನಾಲ್ಕುನ ಗಣಗಳೂ ಒಂದು ಸಗಣವೂ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿವೆ. (6) ಇದಕ್ಕೂ ಶಶಿಕಲೆಗೂ ಒಂದೇ ಲಕ್ಷಣ, ಯತಿಭೇದಮಾತ್ರ. (7) ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿದೆ. (8) ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಗಂಧಿ, ಶಾಲಿಣೀ, ಚಾಮರ, ಪ್ರಶಾಂತಿ ಎಂದು ನಾಲ್ಕುಹೆಸರಿವೆ. ಇವಲ್ಲದೆ ನಾ. ಛಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಕೇಸರ, ನವನಲಿನ, ವಿಚಿತ್ರ, ಲಲಿತ (ಅನಲಗತಿ ಪಾ. ಅಲಗತಿ) ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿ, ನಲಿನಿ, ಇಲಾ, ಚಂದ್ರರೇಖ ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿವೆ.

(7) ಮಣಿಭೂಷಣವೃತ್ತಂ—ರಂನತಂ ಭರಗಳುಂ ಕೂಡೆಯುಂ ಮಣಿ  
ಭೂಷಣಂ ||

(೧೬) ಅಷ್ಟಿ ಎಂಬ ಪದಿನಾಟನೆಯ ಭಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಅಋವತ್ತಯ್ಯ  
ಸಾವಿರದ ಅಯ್ಯೂರು ಮೂವತ್ತಾಋ ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ, ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ.

(1) ಋಷಭವಿಲಸಿತವೃತ್ತಂ—ಭ್ರಂತ್ರಿನಗಂ ನವಾಂಗಮೃಷಭವಿಲಸಿತ  
ಯಿದುಂ<sup>1</sup> ||

(2) ವಾಣೀನಿವೃತ್ತಂ—ನ ಜ ಭ ಜ ರಂ ಪ್ರ ಸಿ ದ್ಧ ಮಿ ದು ವಾಣೀನೀ  
ಗಯುಕ್ತಂ<sup>2</sup> ||

(3) ಅಶ್ವಗತಿವೃತ್ತಂ—ಪಂಚಭಕಾರಗ ಮಶ್ವಗತಿ ಪ್ರಥಿತಂ ಸುಭಗಂ<sup>3</sup> ||

(4) ಪಂಚಚಮರವೃತ್ತಂ—ಲಗಂಗಳುಂ ನಿರಂತರಂ ಮನೋಜ್ಞ ಪಂಚ  
ಚಾನುರಂ<sup>4</sup> ||

(5) ಲಲಿತಪದ್ಮವೃತ್ತಂ—ಲಲಿತಪದಮಿದು ನನನಜಂ ಸಗುರುಗಳ್ ತಾ<sup>5</sup> ||

(೧೭) ಅತ್ಯಷ್ಟಿ ಎಂಬ ಪದಿನೇಟನೆಯ ಭಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷದ  
ಮೂವತ್ತೊಂದು ಸಾವಿರದ ಎಪ್ಪತ್ತೆರಡು ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ, ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ.

(1) ಶಿಖರಣೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ರಸಂ ರುದ್ರಚ್ಛಿನ್ನಂ ಯಮನಸಭಲಂಗಂ ಶಿಖ  
ರೀಣೀ ||

(2) ಪೃಥ್ವೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ಜಸಂ ಜಸಯಗಳ್ ಪಸುಗ್ರಹ ವಿಭಿನ್ನ ಪೃಥ್ವೀಲಗಂ ||

(3) ವಂಶಪತ್ರತತಿತಂ—ದಿಬ್ಬುನಿ ವಂಶಪತ್ರಪತಿತಂ ಭರನಭನಲಗಂ ||

(4) ಮಂದಾಕ್ರಾಂತಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮಂದಾಕ್ರಾಂತಾ ಜಲಧಿಷಡಗಂ ಮಂಭನಂ  
ತಂತಗಂಗಂ ||

(5) ಹರಿವೃತ್ತಂ—ರಸಯುಗಹಯಂ ನಂಸಂಮಂರಂ ಸಲಂಗುರುವುಂ ಹರಿ<sup>6</sup> ||

(6) ನರ್ಕುಟಕವೃತ್ತಂ—ಹಯದಿಶದಿಂ ನಜಂ ಭಜಜಲಂಗುರು ನರ್ಕು  
ಟಕಂ<sup>7</sup> ||

(1) ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಗಜವಿಲಸಿತ, ಋಷಭಗತಿವಿಲಸಿತ (ವೃ) (2) ತೆಲುಗಿನಲ್ಲಿ (ವೇದಿನ-ವಾಣಿ)  
(3) ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ. ಪದ್ಮಮುಖಿ, ಜಗದ್ವಂದಿತ? ಪದ್ಮ ಎಂಬ ಹೆಸರುಗಳಿವೆ. (4) ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿದೆ.  
(5) ಇವಲ್ಲದೆ ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಗಳ, ವಿಜಯಾನಂದ ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ. ತೆಲುಗಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಿಯ  
ಕಾಂತ, ಫಲಶದನ, ಮದನ ದರ್ಪಣ ಚಂದ್ರಶೀ ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿವೆ. (6) ಇದೂ  
ಹರಿಣೀಪುತ (ಹರಿಣೀ) ವೂ ಒಂದೇ ಇರಬಹುದು, ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾಲ್ಕನೇ ರಗಣಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ  
ಜಗಣವಿದೆ. (7) ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿದೆ, ಇವಲ್ಲದೆ. ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕನಕಾಬ್ಜಿನೀ ವೃತ್ತವೂ, ತೆಲುಗಿನಲ್ಲಿ  
ಸುಗಂಧಿ, ಪಲಾಶದಳ ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿವೆ.

(7) (ಮಧು)ಕೋಕಿಲವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮುನಿಗುಹಕಾರ್ಣವಂ ಯತಿ ಯುತಂ  
ಮಧುಕೋಕಿಲಕಂ ||

(8) ಹರಿಣೀಪ್ಲುತವೃತ್ತಂ—ನಸಮಜಸಮಾಜೋಳ್ ಭೇದಂ ಲಗಂ  
ಸುಹರಿಣೀಪ್ಲುತಂ ||

(೧೨) ಧೃತಿ ಎಂಬ ಪದಿನೆಂಟನೆಯ ಭಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಎರಡು ಲಕ್ಷದ  
ಅಋವತ್ತೆರಡು ಸಾವಿರದ ನೂರು ನಾಲ್ಕತ್ತು ನಾಲ್ಕು ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ—

(1) ಹರಿಣೀಪ್ಲುತವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮಂಸಂ ಜಂ ಭರ(ಸ)ಂ ಗಜಂ ಯತಿಬಾಣಕಂ  
ಹರಿಣೀಪ್ಲುತಂ<sup>1</sup> ||

(2) ನಿಶಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ನಯುಗಳರ ಚತುಷ್ವಯಂ ತಾಂ ನಿಶಾ ದಿಗ್ವಿಸುಚ್ಛೇ  
ದಿನೀ<sup>2</sup> ||

(3) ಕರಿಣೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ಸನಜಂ ನಭಸಗಣಂ ಶರಯತಿಯುಂ ಬರೆ ಕರಿಣೀ ||

(4) ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾಮಾಲಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾದಿ(ಯ) ಮಾಲೆಯುಂ ರಸಜಂ  
ಜಭಂರಗಣಾನ್ವಿತಂ<sup>3</sup> ||

(೧೯) ಆತಿಧೃತಿ ಎಂಬ ಹತ್ತೊಂಬತ್ತನೆಯ ಭಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಆಯ್ದ  
ಲಕ್ಷದ ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತು ನಾಲ್ಕು ಸಾವಿರದ ಇನ್ನೂ ಐಂಬತ್ತೆಂಟು ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ.

(1) ಮೇಘವಿಸ್ಫೂರ್ಜಿತವೃತ್ತಂ—ರಸರ್ತೃಶ್ಚಂ ಯುಂ ನಂ ರರಗುರುಯುತಂ  
ಮೇಘವಿಸ್ಫೂರ್ಜಿತಂ ತಾಂ ||

(2) ಶಾರ್ದೂಲವಿಕ್ರೀಡಿತವೃತ್ತಂ—ಸೂರ್ಯಾರ್ತಂ ಮಸಜಂ ತತಂ ಗುರು  
ಯುತಂ ಶಾರ್ದೂಲವಿಕ್ರೀಡಿತಂ ||

(3) ಮಣಿದೀಪ್ತಿವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮಂಸಂಸಂ ತಜಯಂ ಮಣಿದೀಪ್ತ್ಯಕ್ಕುಂ ನಿಧಿ  
ದಿಗೃತಿ ಗುರ್ವಾಧ್ಯಂ ||

(4) ವಾಣೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮಂಭಂಸಂಸಂಸಸಗಯುತಂ ನಿಧಿವಿರತಿ ತಾನದು  
ವಾಣೀ ||

(1) ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ, ಇದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಈ ಹೆಸರಿನ ವೃತ್ತವು ೧೭ ನೆಯ ಭಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿವೆ  
(ಅದರ ಲಕ್ಷಣ ನ, ಸ, ಮ, ರ, ಸ, ಲ, ಗ) ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇರೆ ಲಕ್ಷಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಅಕ್ಷರಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ  
೧೭ ಇವೆ. ಲಕ್ಷಣಕ್ಕೂ, ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯಕ್ಕೂ ಹೊಂದಿಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲವಾಗಿತ್ತಿದ್ದಿದೆ. (2) ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿದೆ. (3) ಇದಕ್ಕೆ  
ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತೆ ಕೋಕಿಲ ಎಂದು ಹೆಸರು ಇವಲ್ಲದೆ ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂದರ್ಪಜಾತ (ಕುಸುಮಿತಲತಾ  
ವೇದಿತ. ತೆ.) ಅರವಿಂದ ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ, ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಿನಯ, ತ್ವರಿತಪದಗತಿ, ಹರಸರ್ತನ,  
ಕ್ಷೌಹಾರ ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿವೆ.

(5) ತರಳವೃತ್ತಂ—ತರಳಮುಂ ನಭರಂ ಸಜಂ ಜಗಮೆಂಟಿಹೊಳ್ ಯತಿ  
ಯಪ್ಪುದುಂ<sup>1</sup> ||

(೨೦) ಕೃತಿ ಎಂಬ ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತನೆಯ ಛಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಹತ್ತುಲಕ್ಷದ  
ನಾಲ್ಕತ್ತೆಂಟು ಸಾವಿರದ ಅಯ್ಯೂಷಿಪ್ಪತ್ತಾಱು ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ.

- (1) ಮನೋಜ್ಞವೃತ್ತಂ—ರಂ ಜರಂ ಜರಂ ಜಗಂ, ಲಯುಕ್ತಮಪ್ಪುದುಂ  
ಮನೋಜ್ಞ ವೃತ್ತನಾಮ ||
- (2) ಮತ್ತೇಭವಿಕ್ರೀಡಿತವೃತ್ತಂ—ಸಭರಂನಮಯಲಂಗಮುಂ ತ್ರೈಗದಶಂ  
ಮತ್ತೇಭವಿಕ್ರೀಡಿತಂ ||
- (3) ಉತ್ಪಲಮಾಲಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಉತ್ಪಲಮಾಲೆಯುಂ ಭರನಭಂ ಭರಲಂ  
ಗುರುರುದ್ರ ಭಂಗುರಂ ||
- (4) ವನಮಂಜರೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ಭಂ ಭಭ ಭಂ ರಸ ಲಂಗುರು ಭಾನುಗ ಭೇದನಂ  
ವನಮಂಜರೀ ||

(೨೧) ಪ್ರಕೃತಿ ಎಂಬ ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತೊಂದನೆಯ ಛಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತು  
ಲಕ್ಷದ ತೊಂಬತ್ತೇಳು ಸಾವಿರದ ನೂಱೈವತ್ತೆರಡು ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ.

- (1) ಸ್ತುಗ್ಧರಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮಂ ರಂ ಭಂ ನಂ ಯಯಂಯಂ ತ್ರಿಮುನಿಯತಿ  
ಯುತಂ ಸ್ತುಗ್ಧರಾನಾಮವೃತ್ತಂ ||
- (2) ಚಂಪಕಮಾಲಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ವಿಧುಪುರಭೇದ ಚಂಪಕದಮಾಲೆಯದುಂ  
ನಜಭಂ ಜಜಂಜರಂ ||

(೨೨) ಆಕೃತಿ ಎಂಬ ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತೆರಡನೆಯ ಛಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ನಾಲ್ಕತ್ತೊಂದು  
ಲಕ್ಷದ ತೊಂಬತ್ತು ನಾಲ್ಕು ಸಾವಿರದ ಮುನ್ನೂಱು ನಾಲ್ಕು ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ  
ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ.

- (1) ಸುಭದ್ರಕವೃತ್ತಂ—ಭಂರನರಂ ನರಂ ನಗಣಮುಂ ದಿಗರ್ಕವಿರಮಂ  
ಸುಭದ್ರಕವೆ ಗಂ ||

(1) ಇವಲ್ಲದೆ ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಖಚರಪ್ಪುತ (ಇದು ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ೨೦ ನೆಯ ಛಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿದೆ.)  
ನ. ಭ. ಭ. ಮ. ಸಸಲಗಂ ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತವೂ. ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಚಂದ್ರಕಳ, ಭೂತಿಲಕ, ಕವಿಕಂಠಭೂಷಣ,  
ಶುಭಿಕಾ ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿವೆ. (2) ಇವಲ್ಲದೆ ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಅನವದ್ಯ (ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಖಚರಪ್ಪುತ)  
ನಗರಂಜಿತ (ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಬುರುಹ) ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ, ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಭಾಕಲಿತ ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತವೂ  
ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿದೆ. (3) ಇವಲ್ಲದೆ ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ತರಂಗ, ಲಲಿತಗತಿ ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ, ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿ  
ವನಮಂಜರೀ, ಲಾಟೀವಿಟಿ, ಮಣಮಾಲಾ, ಕರಿಬ್ಬಂಹಿತ, ಕನಕಲತಾ, ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿವೆ.  
(4) ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಭದ್ರಕ. ಇವಲ್ಲದೆ, ವನಮಂಜರಿ (ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನಿನಿ) ಚೂತಕುಜ ಎಂಬ  
ವೃತ್ತವೂ, ತೆ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ತುರಗ, ಮುದ್ರಿಕ, ವಿಚಿಕಿಲಿತ ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿವೆ.

- (2) \*ಮಹಾಸ್ರಗ್ಧರಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಸತತಂ ನಂಸಂ ರರಂಗಂ ತ್ರಿದಶಯತಿ ಮಹಾ  
ಸ್ರಗ್ಧರಾನಾಮವೃತ್ತಂ ||
- (3) 1ಮತ್ತೇಭವೃತ್ತಂ—ತಂಭಂ ಯಜಂ ಸರನಗಂ ಪಜ್ಞಾ ಸೂರ್ಯ  
ಯತಿ ಮತ್ತೇಭಮೆದುಕಥಿತಂ ||
- (4) ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ನಯಸಭಯುಕ್ತಂ ನನನಗಂ ದಶರವಿಕ್ಯತಯತಿ  
ಯಿದು ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀ ||

(೨೩) ವಿಕೃತಿ ಎಂಬ ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತುಮೂರನೆಯ ಭಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಎಂಭತ್ತು  
ಮೂರು ಲಕ್ಷದ ತೊಂಭತ್ತೆಂಟುಸಾವಿರದ ಆಱುನೂಣ್ಕೆಂಟು ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವು  
ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ.

- (1) 2ಮತ್ತಾಕ್ರೀಡಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮತ್ತಾಕ್ರೀಡಾಮಂವಂ ತನಂ ನನನಲ  
ಗುರುವಸು ಶರದಶಯತಿಯುಂ ||
- (2) ಹಂಸಗತಿವೃತ್ತಂ—ನಜಜಜಂ ಜಜಂಜಂ ಲಗಂ ರುದ್ರಚ್ಛಿನ್ನಂ ಸ್ತುತಂ  
ಪ್ರಾಜ್ಞರಿಂ ಹಂಸಗತಿಃ ||

(೨೪) ಸಂಕೃತಿ ಎಂಬ ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತು ನಾಲ್ಕನೆಯ ಭಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಒಂದುಕೋಟಿ  
ಯುನವತ್ತೇಳುಲಕ್ಷ ತೊಂಬತ್ತೇಳುಸಾವಿರದೊಮ್ಮೂರು ಹದಿನಾಲ್ಕುಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ.  
ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ.

- (1) ಅಶ್ವಲಲಿತವೃತ್ತಂ—ನಜಭಸಜಂ ಸಜಂ ಸಗಣದಿಯುಕ್ತ ಮಶ್ವಲಲಿತ  
ಸ್ವರೇಶರಸದೋಳ್ ||
- (2) ತನ್ನೀವೃತ್ತಂ—ಭೂತಮುನೀನಂ ಯತಿ ಭತನಸಭಂ ಭನಯಮುಂ  
ಬರಲಿದನಣಿ ತನ್ನೀ4

\* ಮೂಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ರಗ್ಧರಾ ಎಂದಿದೆ. ಯತಿಯುತಂ ಸ್ರಗ್ಧರಾ ನಾಮ ಎಗದು ಲಕ್ಷಣ ಇರುವುದು.  
ಆದರೆ ಇದು ಮಹಾಸ್ರಗ್ಧರಾವೃತ್ತವೆಂದು ಇತರ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಭಂದಸ್ಸುಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ  
ಮೇಲೆ ಹಾಗೆತ್ತಿದ್ದಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ.

(1) ಮತ್ತೇಭ, ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮೀವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಮುಂದಣ ಭಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿವೆ ೨೨ ಅಕ್ಷರಗಳಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ  
ಭಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿರಬೇಕು. ಇವಲ್ಲದೆ ಸುಂದರನೆಂಬ ವೃತ್ತವೂ ತೆ, ನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಶ್ವಲಲಿತ, ಪದ್ಮನಾಭ ಎಂಬ  
ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿವೆ. (2) ನಾ. ಭಂ-ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ರೀಡೆಯೆಂದಿದೆ. (3) ತೆ-ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ “ಕವಿರಾಜ  
ರಾಜಿತ” ಎಂದು ಹೆಸರು. (4) ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾ. ಭಂ-ನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಂದರ ಎಂದಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಆ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಿ  
ಪದ್ಮದ ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತನ್ನಿ ಎಂದಿರುವುದು ತನ್ನೀ ಎಂದಿರಬಹುದು. ಮತ್ತು ಸುಂದರವೃತ್ತವೆಂದು  
ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿಶೇಷಣವಾಗಿರಬಹುದು. ಅದಕಾರಣ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಈ ವೃತ್ತಕ್ಕೆ ತನ್ನಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದೇ  
ಉಚಿತವಾಗಿದೆ. ವೃತ್ತ ರತ್ನಾಕರದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ತನ್ನೀ ಎಂದೇ ಇದೆ.

(3) ಲಲಿತವೃತ್ತಂ—ಲಲಿತಮಿದು ನನಂಭನ ಜನನಯ ಮೇಟುಟಿಗಳು  
ಯತಿ ಬರಲದಕ್ಕುಂ<sup>1</sup> ||

(೨೫) ಅಭಿಕೃತಿ ಎಂಬ ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತಯ್ದ ನೆಯ ಛಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಮೂರುಕೋಟಿ  
ಮೂವತ್ತಯ್ದು ಲಕ್ಷ ತೊಂಬತ್ತು ನಾಲ್ಕು ಸಾವಿರ ನಾನೂರು ಮೂವತ್ತೆರಡು ಪ್ರಕಾರ  
ವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ.

(1) ಕ್ರೌಂಚಪದವೃತ್ತಂ—ಕ್ರೌಂಚಪದಂ ಭಭರಂ ನನನಂ ನಗಂ ಮುನಿ  
ಶರವಸು ಶರವಿರತಿಯುತಂ<sup>2</sup> ||

(2) ಹಂಸಪದವೃತ್ತಂ—ವಸುತಿಥಿಯತಿ ನನನನ ಸಭಭಂ ಭಗಮುಂ ಬರೆ  
ತಾನದು ಹಂಸಪದಂ<sup>3</sup> ||

(೨೬) ಉತ್ಕೃತಿ ಎಂಬ ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತನೆಯ ಛಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಆರುಕೋಟಿ  
ಯೆಪ್ಪತ್ತೊಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ತೊಂಬತ್ತೆಂಟು ಸಾವಿರ ದೆಂಟುನೂರು ಮತ್ತು ನಾಲ್ಕು ಪ್ರಕಾರ  
ವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ.

(1) ಭುಜಗವಿಜೃಂಭಿತವೃತ್ತಂ—ವಸ್ತೀಶಾಶ್ವಚ್ಛೇದೋಪೇತಂ ಮಮತನ  
ಯುಗ ನರಸಲಗಂ ಭುಜಂಗವಿಜೃಂಭಿತಂ ||

(2) ಅಪವಾಹವೃತ್ತಂ—ಮ್ನಂ ಪಟ್ಟಿಂ ಸಗಣಗುರು ನವರಸರಸಶರಮತಿ  
ಯುತ ಮಪವಾಹಾಖ್ಯಂ<sup>4</sup> ||

(3) ಶಂಭುನಟನವೃತ್ತಂ—ಜಸಂ ನಭಜಸಂ ನಭಲಗಂ ಮನುದಿವಾಕರ  
ಯತಿ ಪ್ರಥಿತ ಶಂಭುನಟನಂ ||

(4) ವನಲತಾವೃತ್ತಂ—ತ್ರಿವಸು ವಸುಯುಗ ಯತಿ ನನನ ನನನನನ  
ಗಗಮಿದು ವನಲತಾಖ್ಯಂ ||

(1) ನಾ. ಛಂ-ನಲ್ಲಿ ಪಂಕಜ, ಅರ್ಕಮರೀಚಿ, ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ ತೆ-ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ರೌಂಚಪದ  
(ಈ ವೃತ್ತವು ನಾ. ಛಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ೨೫-ನೆಯ ಛಂದಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿದೆ.) ಅಷ್ಟಮೂರ್ತಿ ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತಗಳೂ  
ಹೆಚ್ಚಿವೆ. (2) ಈ ಲಕ್ಷಣವು ನಾ. ಛಂ-ನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಲಕ್ಷಣಕ್ಕೆ ಭಿನ್ನವಾಗಿದೆ. (ಭ ಮ ಸ ಭನನ  
ನನಗ.) (3) ತೆ-ನಲ್ಲಿ “ಬಂಧುರ” ವೆಂದು ಹೆಸರು. (ಲಕ್ಷಣ ನನನನಸಭಭಭಗ) ನಾ. ಛಂ-ನಲ್ಲಿ  
ವಿಧಳಿತಸರಸಿಜ, ಜಲಧರಗತಿ (ಧರಣಿಧರಗತಿ) ಎಂಬುವೂ, ತೆ-ನಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಸ್ಕರವಿಲಸಿತ ವೃತ್ತವೂ  
ಹೆಚ್ಚಿವೆ. (4) ಇಲ್ಲಿ “ವಸ್ತೀಶಾಶ್ವಚ್ಛೇದೋಪೇತಂ” ಮಮತನಯುಗ ನರಸಲಗೈರ್ಭುಜಂಗ  
ವಿಜೃಂಭಿತಂ—ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತರತ್ನಾಕರದ ಲಕ್ಷಣಾನುಪೂರ್ವಿಯನ್ನೇ ಅನುಸರಿಸುವನು. (5) ತೆ-ನಲ್ಲಿ  
ವರಾಹವೆಂದು ಹೆಸರು.



(5) ಜಲೋದ್ಧತವೃತ್ತಂ—ಜಲೋದ್ಧತವು ಮೋಡಶಭಿದಂ ಜಸನಭಂ  
ಜಸನಭಂ ಲಘುಯುಗಂ ಗಮಿಸುಗೆ<sup>1</sup> ||

ಇಂತು ಭಂದೋಗತಮಪ್ಪ ಸಮವೃತ್ತಕೂಟಂ ೧೩, ೪೨, ೧೭, ೭೮ ವೃತ್ತಂಗಳ  
ಇವು.

— ಗದ್ಯಂ —

ಇತಿ ಶ್ರೀಮದನುಪಮ ನಿತ್ಯನಿರಂಜನ ಪರಮಾತ್ಮಾರ್ಹದಾರಾಧನಾಪರಮಾನಂದ

ಬಂಧುರ ಗುಣಚಂದ್ರ ವಿರಚಿತಮಪ್ಪ

ಭಂದಸ್ಸಾರದೊಳ

ಭಂದೋಗತ ಸಮವೃತ್ತಪ್ರಕರಣಂ

ತ್ಯತೀಯಂ.

—

(1) ಇವಲ್ಲದೆ ನಾ. ಭಂ-ನಲ್ಲಿ ಮುನಿಸುತ ಎಂಬುದೂ, ತೆ-ನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಗಳ ಮಹಾಶ್ರೀ ಎಂಬುದೂ  
ಹೆಚ್ಚಿವೆ.

# ಚತುರ್ಥಾಧಿಕಾರಂ —ಸಂಕೀರ್ಣ ವೃತ್ತಂಗಳ್—

೧. ದಂಡಕ-ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ.

(೧) 1ಚಂಡವೃಷ್ಟಿದಂಡಕಂ—

ನಯುಗರನಗ ರೂಢಮುಂ ಪಂಡಿತಸ್ವೀಡಿತಂ  
ಚಂಡವೃಷ್ಟಿ ಪ್ರಸಾತಂ ವರಂ ದಂಡಕಂ

|| ೧ ||

(೨) ಅರ್ಣ, (೩) ಅರ್ಣವ, (೪) ವ್ಯಾಳ, (೫) ಜೀಮೂತ, (೬) ಲೀಲಾಕರ,  
(೭) ಉದ್ಧಾಮ, (೮) ಶಂಖ, ಅದಿದಂಡಕ ಲಕ್ಷಣಂ ;

ಚರಣ ಚರಣ ರೇಫೆಯಿಂ ವೃದ್ಧಿಯಂ  
ಕೈಗೆಯೆ ಬರ್ಕುಮರ್ಣಾರ್ಣವಂ ವ್ಯಾಳ  
ಜೀಮೂತ ಲೀಲಾಕರೋದ್ಧಾಮ ಶಂಖಾದಿಗಳ್  
ಪಂಡಿತ ಪ್ರೌಢಿಯಿಂದಿಂತು ತಾಂ ನೀಡುಗುಂ

|| ೨ ||

(೯) 2ಪ್ರಚಿತಕದಂಡಕಂ—

ಪ್ರಚಿತಕನೆಸರಿನಿಂ ದಂಡಕಂ ನದ್ವಿಕಂ  
ಸಪ್ತಯಂ ಸಾರೆಯಕ್ಕುಂ ಶುಭಾಢ್ಯಂ ಸಮಾಢ್ಯಂ

|| ೩ ||

ಇಂತು ದಂಡಕ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ.

(1) ನಾ. ಭಂ.ನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ (ಅ. ೩. ೨೩-೨೪ ರಲ್ಲಿ) ಈ ದಂಡಕಗಳ ಲಕ್ಷಣವು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಉದ್ಧಾಮ, ಶಂಖ, ಇವು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವು ವೃತ್ತರತ್ನಾಕರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಇವಲ್ಲದೆ ಪ್ರಚಿತಕನೆಂಬ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ದಂಡಕವೂ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ.

ಯದಿಹ ನಯುಗಳಂ ತತಸ್ತಪ್ತರೇಫಾಃ.ತದಾ ಚಂಡವೃಷ್ಟಿಪ್ರಯಾ(ಪಾ) ತೋ ಭವೇದ್ವಂಡಕಃ|  
ಪ್ರತಿಚರಣವಿವೃದ್ಧರೇಫಾಃ ಸ್ಕುರರ್ಣವನ್ಯಾಳಜೀಮೂತಲೀಲಾಕರೋದ್ಧಾಮಶಂಖಾದಯಃ||

(2) ಪ್ರಚಿತಕಸಮುಭಿಧೋಧೀರಧೀಭಿಃ ಸ್ವತೋದಂಡಕೋ ನದ್ವಯಾದುತ್ತರೈಸ್ತಪ್ತಭಿಯೈಃ||

### ೨. ಆರ್ಯಾ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ.

(೧) 1ಪಥ್ಯಾನಾಮಾರ್ಯಾ—

ದಳದೊಳಗಾದ್ಯಂ ಪಾದಂ ಪೊಳೆಯಲ್

ತ್ಯಂಶಾದ್ಯಮದು ಪಥ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಂ |

ವಳಿಸುವಿತರಾಂಘ್ರಿಗಳೊಳು ತಿಳಿ

ಗಣಗಳ ನಿಯಮಮೆಲ್ಲ ಬುಧಮತದಿಂ

|| ೧ ||

(೨) 2ವಿಪುಲಾರ್ಯಾ—

ದಾಂಟರ್ಪ ಗಣತ್ರಯನಾದಿನುಂ ಘಟಿತಮಾಗೆ ಯಂಘ್ರಿ ವಿಪುಲಾಖ್ಯಂ || ೨ ||

(೩) 3ಚಪಲಾರ್ಯಾ—

4ದ್ವಿತೀಯಾರ್ಥದೊಳ್ ಜಕಾರಂ ದ್ವಿತೀಯತುರ್ಯಂ ಗಮಧ್ಯಗಂ ತೋಱಲ್ |

ಸತತಂ ಚಪಲಾನಾನುಂ ಸ್ತುತಪ್ರಬೋಧರ್ಥಂ ರೂಢಂ || ೩ ||

(೪) 5ಮುಖಚಪಲಾರ್ಯಾ—

ಆದ್ಯಂ ದಳಂ ಸಮಸ್ತಂ ಪ್ರಧಾನಮಾಗಿ ಚಪಲಾಗತಂ ತೋಱಲ್ |

ಹೃದ್ಯಂ ಪೂರ್ವಜಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಂ ಸಾದ್ಯಂ ಶೇಷದೊಳು ಮುಖಚಪಲಾ || ೪ ||

(೫) 6ಜಘನಚಪಲಾರ್ಯಾ—

ಆದಿ ಸುಬೋಧಿತ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಂ ಮೊದಲೊಳ್ ಮೊದಲೊಳ್ ಬರಲ್ಕೆ ಚಪಲೋತ್ಥಂ |

ಪೊಂದಲ್ ಪರಾರ್ಥದೊಳಂ ತಾಂ ವಿಧಾನದಿಂದಂ ಜಘನಚಪಲಾ || ೫ ||

ಇಂತು ಆರ್ಯಾ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ.

(1) ವೃ. ರ. ಅ. ೨. ಪ. ೩. (2) ಅ. ೨. ಪ. ೪. (3) ಅ. ೨. ಪ. ೫. (4) ಉಭಯಾರ್ಥ. (5) ಅ. ೨.-ಪ. ೬. (6) ಅ. ೨.-ಪ. ೭.

## ೩. ಗೀತಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ.

(೭) 1 ಉಪಗೀತ್ಯಾರ್ಯಾ—

ಆರ್ಯಾಪರಾರ್ಥಲಕ್ಷ್ಯಂ ಪರ್ಯುದಿತಂ ಸರ್ವದೋಳ್ ತೋಜಲ್ |  
ನಾರ್ಯಾಪಗೀತಿ ಸುವಿಶದ ವರ್ಯಾದಿಮಕವಿವಿತಿ ಪ್ರೀತಂ || ೧ ||

(೭) 2 ಉದ್ಗೀತ್ಯಾರ್ಯಾ—

ಆರ್ಯಾಶಕಲದ್ವಿತಯಂ ಕಾರ್ಯಾದ್ವಿವಿಪರಿತ ಭಾವಾಧ್ಯಂ |  
ಸ್ಮಯೋದ್ಗೀತಿ ಪೆಸರಿನಿಂ ಪರ್ಯಾಪ್ತಜ್ಞೇದ ಭೇದ ಸಂಹೃದ್ಯಂ || ೨ ||

(೮) 3 ಆರ್ಯಗೀತಿ—

ಆರ್ಯಗೀತ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಂ ಗುರುಶಿರದಲ್ಲೊಪ್ಪಿರೆ ಯಾರ್ಯೆಯ ಸುಪೂರ್ವಾರ್ಥಂ |  
ಪರಿಶೇಷಂ ಗೀತಿನಿಭಂ ಗುರೂಪಗತಮಿಂತು ಪೇಲ್ವರ್ ಧೀರರ್ || ೩ ||

ಇಂತು ಗೀತಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ.

## ೪. ನೈತಾಳೀಯ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ.

(೧) 4 ನೈತಾಳೀಯಂ—

ಮುತ್ತಿದ ಕಲಿಯಾಜುಮೋಜದೋಳ್ ದಂತಿಕಲೆ ಸಮದಿ ರಂಲಗಂ ಬರಲ್ |  
ಯತಿಚರಣ ಬಂದೊಡಾಗನುಂ ನೈತಾಳೀಯಂ ಪ್ರಾಜ್ಞಭಾಷಿತಂ || ೧ ||

(೨) 5 ಔಪಚ್ಛಂದಸಿಕಂ—

ಉಪಗತರಮಯಂತ್ಯದೋಳು ತಾನೌಪಚ್ಛಂದಸಿಕಂ ಸುಧೀಸಮುಕ್ತಂ || ೨ ||

(೩) 6 ಆಸಾತಲಿಕಾ—

ಆಸಾತಲಿಕಾಭಗಯುಗ್ಗಂ ತಪ್ಪದೆ ಪೂರ್ವಗಣಂ ಬರಲನ್ಯಂ || ೩ ||

(1) ಗೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಈತನು ೨ನೆಯ ಅಧ್ಯಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವನು. ಅ. ೨-ಗೀತಿ ಪ್ರ. ೨.  
(2) ಅ. ೨-ಗೀತಿ ಪ್ರ. ೩. (3) ಅ. ೨-ಗೀತಿ ಪ್ರ. ೪. (4) (ವೃತ್ತ) ಅ. ೨-ನೈತಾಳೀ ಪ್ರ. ೧.  
(5) ನೈ. ಅ. ೨. ನೈತಾಳೀ ೨. (6) ಅ. ೨. ನೈತಾಳೀ ೩. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ದಾಕ್ಷಿಣಾಂತಿಕಾ ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತವು  
ಗಣಿತನಾದಂತಿದೆ. (ತೃತೀಯಯುಕ್ತಾಕ್ಷಿಣಾಂತಿಕಂ ಸಮಸ್ತಪಾದದೋಳ್ ದ್ವಿತೀಯಲಂ. ನೈ. ೪. ಎಂದೂ  
ಅದರ ಲಕ್ಷಣವನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

(೪) 1ಉದೀಚ್ಯವೃತ್ತಂ—

ಉದೀಚ್ಯವೃತ್ತಂ ದ್ವಿತೀಯಲಂ ಮುಂದಣಲಯುತಂ ಸ್ವಾಜಸಾದದೊಳ್ || ೪ ||

(೫) 2ಪ್ರಾಚ್ಯವೃತ್ತಂ—

ಪ್ರಾಚ್ಯವೃತ್ತ ಮಯ್ದು ನಾಲ್ಕುವುಂ ಸಂಚಿಸ್ತೆಲಘುಗಳ್ ಯುಗಸಾದದೊಳ್ || ೫ ||

(೬) 3ಪ್ರವೃತ್ತಕಂ—

ಸಮಮಾಗಲು ಮೋಜಯುಗ್ಗದೊಳ್ ಸಮುದಿತಚರಣಗಳ್ ಪ್ರವೃತ್ತಕಂ || ೬ ||

(೭) 4ಅಪರಾಂತಿಕಂ—

ಅಪರಾಂತಿಕಮಿದು ಯುಗ್ಗರಂಜಿತಂ || ೭ ||

(೮) 5ಚಾರುಹಾಸಿನೀ—

ಅಯುಗ್ಗವಂ ಚಾರುಹಾಸಿನೀ || ೮ ||

ಇಂತು ವೈತಾಳೀಯ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ.

೫. ಅನುಷ್ಟುಭ್ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ.

(೧) 6ವಕ್ತ್ರಂ—

ಲಬ್ಧಾಸಾದ್ಯಂ ನಸಂ ವಕ್ತ್ರಮಬ್ಧ್ಯುತ್ಪತ್ತರಮನುಷ್ಟುಭಂ || ೧ ||

(೨) 7ಪಥ್ಯಾವಕ್ತ್ರಂ—

ನೇತ್ರಾಬ್ಧಿಯೊಳಯ್ದು ಟಂ ಜಂ ಪಥ್ಯಾವಕ್ತ್ರಂ ಪ್ರಕೀರ್ತಿತಂ || ೨ ||

(೩) 8ವಿಪರೀತ ಪಥ್ಯಾವಕ್ತ್ರಂ—

ಓಜದೊಳಜಂ ಸುಬಾಣದಿಂ ನಿಜಾಂಕ ವಿಪರೀತಾದಿ || ೩ ||

(1) ಅ. ೨ ವೈತಾಳೀ ೫. (2) ಅ. ೨ ವೈತಾಳೀ ೬. (3) ಅ. ೨ ವೈತಾಳೀ ೭. (4) ಅ. ೨ ವೈತಾಳೀ ೮. (5) ಅ. ೨ ವೈತಾಳೀ ೯. (6) ಅ. ೨ ಅನು. ಪ್ರ. ೧. (7) ಅ. ೨ ಅನು. ಪ್ರ. ೨. (8) ಅ. ೨ ಅನು. ಪ್ರ. ೩.

(೪) 1ಚಪಲಾವಕ್ತ್ರಂ--

ಚಪಲಾವಕ್ತ್ರಂ ಬೆಸದೊಳ್ ನ ಪಂಚಮಾದಿ ವರ್ಣೋತ್ಕಂ || ೪ ||

(೫) 2ಯುಗ್ಮವಿಪುಲಂ--

ಯುಗ್ಮೋತ್ಕಂ ಸಪ್ತಮಂ ಲಂ ತಾಂ-ಯುಗ್ಮಾದಿವಿಪುಲಂ ಮತಂ || ೫ ||

(೬) 3ಭವಿಪುಲಂ--

ಬಾಣಾದಿ ಭಂ ಭವಿಪುಲಂ || ೬ ||

(೭) 4ರವಿಪುಲಂ--

ರಾದ್ಯಮಕ್ಕುಂ ರಂ ಶರಾದ್ಯಂ || ೭ ||

(೮) 5ನವಿಪುಲಂ--

ನಂ ಶರಾದ್ಯಂ ನವಿಪುಲಂ || ೮ ||

(೯) 6ತವಿಪುಲಂ--

ತಾದ್ಯಂ ತಾಂತಂ ಬಾಣಾದಿಕಂ || ೯ ||

ಇಂತು ಅನುಷ್ಟುಭ್ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ.

### ಷೋಡಶಮಾತ್ರಾ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ.

೧. ಷೋಡಶಮಾತ್ರಾ ದ್ವಿಪಾದ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ.

(೧) 7ಅಚಲಧೃತಿ--

ಸ್ವರಪರಿಮಿತಲಘು ಲಸಿತಮಚಲಧೃತಿ || ೧ ||

(೨) 8ಮಾತ್ರಾಸಮಕಂ--

ಮಾತ್ರಾಸಮಕಂ ನಿಧಿಲಂಗಾಂತಂ || ೨ ||

(೩) 9ವಿಶ್ಲೋಕಂ--

ಜಗಣಂ ಶರಾದಿಯಿಂ ವಿಶ್ಲೋಕಂ || ೩ ||

- (1) ಅ. ೨ ಅನು. ಪ್ರ. ೪. (2) ಅ. ೨ ಅನು. ಪ್ರ. ೫. (3) ಅ. ೨ ಅನು. ಪ್ರ. ೬.  
 (4) ಅ. ೨ ಅನು. ಪ್ರ. ೭. (5) ಅ. ೨ ಅನು. ಪ್ರ. ೮. (6) ಅ. ೨ ಅನು. ಪ್ರ. ೯. (7) ದ್ವಿಕಗು  
 ಷಿತ ವಸುಲಘುರಚಲಧೃತಿರಿತೆ (ಅ. ೨ ಷೋಡ ಪ್ರ. ೧). (8) ಮಾತ್ರಾಸಮಕಂ ನವಮೋಲ್ಕಂ  
 (...೨) (9) ಜೋಗಾವಧಾಂಬುಧೇರ್ವಿಶ್ಲೋಕಃ (...೩).

(೪) 1ನವಾಸಿಕಂ—

ರಂಧ್ರಮುಖಂ ಜಂ ನವಾಸಿಕಾಖ್ಯಂ || ೪ ||

(೫) 2ಚಿತ್ರಂ—

ಬಾಣಾಷ್ಟ್ರನವದೆ ಲಘುವಂ ಚಿತ್ರಂ || ೫ ||

೨. ಪೋಡಶಮಾತ್ರಾ ಚತುಷ್ಟಾದ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ

(೧) ಪದಾಕುಲಕಂ—

ಇದತೀತ ವಿವಿಧಲಕ್ಷ್ಯಯುತಂ ಮಾತ್ರಾಸಮಾದಿ ಪಾದಪ್ರಥಿತಂ |  
ಅನಿಯತವೃತ್ತ ಪರಿಮಾಣಯುಕ್ತಂ ಜಗದೋಳ ಪೊಗಟ್ಟುದು ಪದಾಕುಲಕಂ ||೧||

ಇಂತು ಪೋಡಶಮಾತ್ರಾ ಚತುಷ್ಟಾದ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ

(೨) 4ಗುರುಲಘುಜ್ಞಾನೋಪಾಯಂ

ಕಂ|| ದ್ವಿಗುಣಿತ ವೃತ್ತಾಕ್ಷರದೊಳ |  
ಗೊಗದಿಹ ಮಾತ್ರೈಗಳ ಕಳೆಯೆ ಲಘುವಂ ಬರ್ಕುಂ ||  
ಮಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರೈಯೊಳಕ್ಷರಮಂ |  
ತೆಗೆಯಲ್ಕುದು ಗುರುಗಳೆಂದು ತಿಳಿ ಸಿದ್ಧಾಂತಂ || ೨ ||

೩. ಪಾದಪಾದ ಭಿನ್ನಮಾತ್ರಾ ದ್ವಿಪಾದ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ

(೧) ಶಿಖಾವೃತ್ತಂ—

ಇದ್ವಿಗುಣಿತ ಮನುಪರಿಮಿತ ಲಘುಯುತಮುಪರಿತನಗುರುವಿಷಮಚರಣಾರ್ಥಂ |  
ತ್ರಿಗುಣಿತ ದಶವಿಲಸಿತ ಲಘುಪರಿಮಿಳಿತಮುಪರಿತನಗುರು ಶುಭಗಮಿದು ಶಿಖಾ ||

(೨) ಖಂಜವೃತ್ತಂ—

ಪ್ರಥಮ ಚರಮ ಚರಣ ವಿನಿಮಯ ವಿರಚಿತಪರಿಗತ ಲಘುಜನನ ವಿತತ ಶಿಖಂ |  
ಪ್ರಥಿತ ನವರಸಭರಿತ ಸುಕವಿನಿಕರಪರಿಕಥಿತಮಿದು ಇಮಿಳಿತಖಂಜಂ || ೨ ||

(1) ತದ್ಭುಗಲಾದ್ವಾ ನವಾಸಿಕಾಸ್ಯಾತ್ (೪...). (2) ಬಾಣಾಷ್ಟ್ರನವಸು ಯದಿ ಲಕ್ಷಿತಾ (೫...).  
(3) ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕವಿಯು ಪಾದಾಕ್ಷರವನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. “ಯದತೀತವಿವಿಧಶುಭಲಕ್ಷ್ಯಯುಕ್ತಮಾತ್ರಾ  
ಸಮಾದಿಪಾದ್ಯಃ ಕಥಿತಂ || ಅನಿಯತವೃತ್ತ ಪರಿಮಾಣಯುಕ್ತಂ ಪ್ರಥಿತಂ ಜಗತ್ಪಂಚ ಪದಾಕುಲಕಂ||”  
(ಅ. ೨-ಪೋ. ಪ್ರ. ೧). (4) ಅಥಗುರುಲಘುಜ್ಞಾನೋಪಾಯಃ-ವೃತ್ತಸ್ಯ ಲಾವಿಸಾ ವರ್ಣೈರ್ ಗಾವರ್ಣಾ  
ಗುರುಭಿನ್ನಾ || ಗುರುಪೋಲ್ವೈರ್ಧೀ ನಿತ್ಯಂ ಪ್ರಮಾಣಮಿತಿ ನಿಶ್ಚಿತಂ || (ವೈ. ರ. ಅ. ೨. ಗು. ೨.)  
(5) (ವೈ. ರ. ಅ. ೨ ಭಿನ್ನಮಾತ್ರಾದ್ವಿಪಾದ್ಯಾತ್-೧) (6) ವೃತ್ತರತ್ನಾಕರದಲ್ಲಿ-ಖಂಜಾ-ಎಂದಿದೆ (ಭಿನ್ನ  
ಮಾ. ಪ್ರ. ೨).

(೩) ಅನಂಗಕ್ರೀಡಾವೃತ್ತಂ—

1 ಪೂರ್ವಾರ್ಧಂ ದ್ವಿದ್ವ್ಯಭ್ಯಸ್ತಾ-ಷ್ಟಂ ಗಂ ವರ್ಯಾನಂಗಕ್ರೀಡಾಖ್ಯಂ |  
ಭುವನ (ನಿ) ಧಿಗುಣಿ (ತ) ವಸುವರಲಘುವಧುರತಮಮಪರದಳಮಿದು ನುತ  
ಕವಿಕೃತಿ || ೩ ||

(೪) ಅತಿರುಚಿರಾವೃತ್ತಂ—

2 ತ್ರಿಗುಣ ನವಲಘು ವವಸಿತಿಗುರುವಿದು ದಳಯುಗ ಕೃತತನು ವತಿರುಚಿರಾ || ೪ ||  
ಇಂತು ಪಾದಪಾದ ಭಿನ್ನ ಮಾತ್ರಾದ್ವಿಪಾದ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ.

## ಅರ್ಧಸಮವೃತ್ತ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ

(೧) ದ್ರುತಮಧ್ಯವೃತ್ತಂ—

8 ಓಜದಿ ಭತ್ರಯ ಯುಗ್ಮಗಂಗಳ್—ಯುಗದೊಳು ನಂಜ ಜಯಂ ದ್ರುತಮಧ್ಯಂ ||

(೨) ಉಪಚಿತ್ರವೃತ್ತಂ—

4 ಬೆಸದೊಳ್ ಬರಲುಂ ಸಸಂಜಗಂಗೆಂ—ಸ್ವಾರುಗಭಂ ಗಗಮಾಗುಪಚಿತ್ರಂ || ೨ ||

(೩) ವೇಗವತೀವೃತ್ತಂ—

6 ಸಸಂ ಬೆಸನೊಳ್ ಗಗಮಾಗಲ್—ಭಂತಿಖಿ ವೇಗವತೀ ದ್ವಿಗಯುಕ್ತಂ || ೩ ||

(೪) ಭದ್ರವಿರಾಡ್ವೃತ್ತಂ—

8 ಓಜಂ ತಪರಂ ಜರಂ ಗಮಕ್ಕುಂ—ವೃಂಜ್ಞಂ ಭದ್ರವಿರಾಟ್ ಸಮಾಖ್ಯ [ಮಕ್ಕುಂ]

(೫) ಕೇತುಮತೀವೃತ್ತಂ—

7 ಯುತಸಂ ಸಜಂ ಸಗುರುವೋಜಂ—ಕೇತುಮತೀ ಭ್ರನಂ ಸಮದೆ ಗಂಗೆ || ೫ ||

(೬) ವಿಯೋಗಿನೀವೃತ್ತಂ—

8 ಸಸಜಂ ಗುರುವೋಜದೊಳ್ ಸಮೋ-ತ್ಥ ಸಭಂ ರಂಲಗಮಾ ವಿಯೋಗಿನೀ || ೬ ||

(1) ಭಿನ್ನ ಮಾ. ಪ್ರ. ೩. (2) ಭಿನ್ನ ಮಾ. ಪ್ರ. ೪. (3) ವೃ. ಅ. ೪-೧. (4) ಅ. ೪-೨.  
(5) ಅ ೪-೩. (6) ಅ ೪-೪. (7) ಅ ೪-೫. (8) ಅ ೪-೬.



(೭) ಆಖ್ಯಾನಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಂ—

1ತಂತಂ ಜನಾಖ್ಯಾನಿಕ ನೋಜಗಂಗಂ-ಜತಂಜಗಂಗಂ ಸಮದೋಳ್ ಸಮುತ್ಥಂ\*

(೮) ವಿಪರೀತಾಖ್ಯಾನಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಂ—

2ಜತಂಜಗಂಗಂ ವಿಷಮಂ ಸಮೋತ್ಥಂ-ತಂತಂ ಜಗಂಗಂ ವಿಪರೀತಪೂರ್ವಂ

(೯) ಹರಿಣಪುಣ್ಯವೃತ್ತಂ—

3ಸಸಸಂಲಗಮುಂ ವಿಷಮಾಂಘ್ರಿಯ-ಲ್ಲಿಸೆಗುಮಗ್ನಿಭರಂ ಹರಿಣಪುಣ್ಯತಂ || ೯ ||

(೧೦) ಅವರವಕ್ರವೃತ್ತಂ—

4ಭುಜನ ರಲಗನೋಜದೋಳ್ ಸಮಂ-ನಜಜರಗಾಪರವಕ್ರ ನಾನುಕಂ || ೧೦ ||

(೧೧) ಪುಷ್ಪಿತಾಗ್ರವೃತ್ತಂ—

5ಭುಜನರಯಮನೋಜದೋಳ್ ಬರಲ್ತಾಂ - ನಜಜರಗಂ ಸಮಮಾಗೆ ಪುಷ್ಪಿತಾಗ್ರಂ || ೧೧ ||

(೧೨) ವಸಂತಮಾಲಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಂ—

6ಸಭುಜಂ ಜಗಗಂ ಜಿಸಂ ಸಮೋತ್ಥಂ-ಸಭರಂಯಂ ಸುವಸಂತಮಾಲಿಕಾವ್ಯಂ ||

(೧೩) ಚಂಪಕಮಾಲಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಂ—

7ಸಭುಜಂ ಜಗ ಮೋಜದೋಳ್ ಸಮಂ--ಸಭರಂ ಚಂಪಕಮಾಲಿಕಾ ಲಗಂ || ೧೩ ||

(೧೪) ಪರಾವತೀವೃತ್ತಂ—

8ಓಜದೋಳ್ ರಜಂರಜಂ ಸಮಾಘ್ರಿಯಿಂದೆ-ಸುಜಂರಜಂ ರಗಂಗಳುಂ ಪರಾವತೀ (ತಾಂ) || ೧೪ ||

ಇಂತು ಅರ್ಥ ಸಮವೃತ್ತ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ.

(1) ಅ. ೪. ೭. \*ಇವೆರಡು ವೃತ್ತಗಳು ಇಂದ್ರನಪ್ರ, ಉಪೇಂದ್ರನಪ್ರ ಇವುಗಳ ಪಾದಗಳಿಂದಾದ ಅರ್ಥ. (2) ಅ. ೪. ೮. (3) ಅ. ೪. ೯. (4) ೪. ೧೦. (5) ಅ. ೪. ೧೧. (6) ವ್ಯ. ಅ. ೪. ೧೩. (7) ೪. ೧೪. (8) ೪. ೧೫. ನಾ. ಭಂ. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಚ್ಚುತಕ್ಕ (ಲಕ್ಷಣ 1 ಪಾ. ನಜಜಲಗ, 2 ಭಭಭಗ). ಕಲ್ಪಲತೆ (ಲಕ್ಷಣ 1 ರನರಲಗ 2 ನಜಜರ). ರವಿಪ್ರಭ (ಲಕ್ಷಣ 1 ಸಜಜಜ ಭಗ. 2 ಭಭಭ ಭರತ) ಈ ೩ ವೃತ್ತಗಳುಮಾತ್ರ ಇವೆ.

## ವಿಷಮವೃತ್ತ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ

೧. ಪದಚತುರ್ದರ್ಶ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ

ಪದಚತುರ್ದರ್ಶವೃತ್ತಂ—

1 ಕರಿವರ್ಣಂ ಮುಖಾಂಘ್ರೈಶ್ಚ |  
ಪರದೊಳ್ ಚತುರಕ್ಷರ ಕ್ರಮಾಧಿಕ್ಯಂ ||  
ಬರುತುಂ ಮುಂದೆ ಶರಾಂಕಾನಂದಪ್ರದಂ ವರ್ಯಂ |  
ವರಕನಿಸುತಮಿದಮಕ್ಕುಂ ಪದಚತುರ್ದರ್ಶಾಭಿದಂ ವೃತ್ತಂ || ೧ ||

ಪೀಡಾವೃತ್ತಂ—

2 ಪ್ರಥಮ ಕಥಿತವೃತ್ತಂ |  
ಪ್ರಥಿತ ವಿಷಮಚರಣ ಸಮುತ್ಥಂ ||  
ಪ್ರಥಿತ ಸಕಲಲಘು ಚರಘುಗುರುಯುಗಾಢ್ಯಂ |  
ವೃಥಗುಪಹಿತ ಪದಯತಿ ಬುಧಜನನುತಮಿದು ಪೀಡಾ || ೨ ||

ಕಲಿಕಾವೃತ್ತಂ—

3 ಮೊದಲೆರಡನೆ ಚರಣಂಗಳುಂ ತಾವ್ |  
ಪದವಿನಿಮಯ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಂ ||  
ಕೆದರೆ ಮೊದಲಿನ ತೆಪದೊಳಿರಲಿತರಂಗಳ್ |  
ಬಿದರದೆ ರಣಗತಪಟುಭಟನ ತೆಪದಿ ಕಲಿಕಾವ್ಯಂ || ೩ ||

ಲವಲೀವೃತ್ತಂ—

4 ಮೊಗದೊಳಗೆ ಸೊಗಸಿನಲಿ ಬರಲು ತೃತೀಯಂ |  
ದ್ವಿಗುರುಯುತ ಸಕಲ ಚರಣಾಂತಂ ||  
ನೆಗೆಯೆ ಪುರಕಮಾದ್ಯಂ |  
ಮಿಗೆ ಮೊದಲಿನ ತೆಪದೊಳಿತರಮಿರೆ ಯದು ಲವಲಿ ತಾಂ || ೪ ||

(1) ಅ. ಜ-ಪದ. ೧.. (ನಾ. ಛಂ.ನಲ್ಲಿ, ಅ. ೨೦.) (2) ಜ-ಪದ. ೨. (3) ಜ-ಪದ. ೩.  
(4) ಜ-ಪದ. ೪.

ಅನ್ಯತಥಾರಾವೃತ್ತಂ—

1 ನೊಗದೊಳಗೆ ಮೆಣಿಯುತಿರೆ ರುಚಿರತಮ ಚರಮಪಾದಂ |

ಪ್ರಗತಗುರುಯುಗಾಂತಂ ||

ಅಗಲದೆ ಯಿರುತಿರೆ ದಹನಸವ್ಯಶಪಾದಂ |

ಸೊಗಸಿನೊಳಗಿದುಮನ್ಯತಥಾರಾ

|| ೫ ||

ಇಂತು ಪದಚತುರ್ದಶ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ.

೨. ಉದ್ಗತಾ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ.

ಉದ್ಗತಾವೃತ್ತಂ—

2 ಸಜಸಂ ಲಘು ಪ್ರಥಮಕಾಂಘ್ರಿ |

ಯುಜದೆ ನಸಜಂಗ ಮುದ್ಗತಾ ||

ಮೂಜಗದಿ ಭನಜಲಂಗಯುತಂ |

ಸಜಸಂ ಜಗಂ ಚರಣದೈಕ್ಯದಿಂದೆ ಪೇಟಾ

|| ೧ ||

೩ ಲಲಿತವೃತ್ತಂ—

4 ನಗಣದ್ವಯಂ ಸಗಣಯುಗ್ಮ |

ಮೊಗೆವುದು ಕೃಪೀಟಯೋನಿಯೊಳ್ ||

ಜಗದೊಳಗಿದು ವಿದಿತಂ ಲಲಿತಂ |

[ಬಗ್ಗಿ]ಮಾರ್ಗಮನ್ಯಮರೆ ಪೂರ್ವತುಲ್ಯಕಂ

|| ೨ ||

ಇಂತು ಉದ್ಗತಾ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ

ಉಪಸ್ಥಿತ ಪ್ರಚುಪಿತವೃತ್ತಂ—

5 ಮಂಸಂಜಂ ರ್ಗಗಮಾದ್ಯದೊಳ್ ಪೃಥಕ್ಪದಂ ಬರ್ಕ್ಕಂ |

ಎಸೆಗುಂ ಸನಜರಗಂ ವಲಂ ನನಂ ಸಂ ||

ತ್ರಿನಗಣಕಲಿತ ಜಯೆಂ |

ಪ್ರಚುಪಿತಮಿದು ವಿದಿತಮುಪಸ್ಥಿತ ಪೂರ್ವಂ

|| ೧ ||

(1) ಅ. ೫-ಪದ. ೫. (2) ಅ. ೫ ಉದ್ಗ-೧. (ನಾ. ಭಂ-ನಲ್ಲಿ, ೩-೨೧೨.) (3) ವೃ. ರ.ದಲ್ಲಿ “ಸಾರಭಕ” ಎಂಬ ವೃತ್ತವು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. (4) ವೃ. ಅ. ೫ ಉದ್ಗ-೩. (5) ಈ ಲಕ್ಷಣಪದ್ಯತೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾರವೆಂಬ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. “ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾರೋ ನಪ್ಪಮುದ್ವಿಪ್ಪಮೇಕದ್ವ್ಯಾ ದಿ ಲಗಕ್ರಿಯಾ” ಸಂಖ್ಯಾನುಪದ್ಧಯೋಗಶ್ಚ ಪಡೇತೇ ಪ್ರತ್ಯಯಾಃ ಸ್ವತಃ ಎಂದು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ಅದು ಪ್ರತ್ಯಯಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದೆ.

[ಪ್ರವರ್ಧಮಾನ]ವೃತ್ತಂ--

ನಂನಂ ಸಂ ನನ ವಚ್ಚಿಪಾದದೊಳ್ ಬರುತಿಕ್ಕುಂ |  
ಜನಿತಾದ್ಯಸದಯತಿ ಪ್ರವರ್ಧಮಾನಮ್ ||  
ನೆನೆಯುಟಾದಗಣಮೆ ಪೂರ್ವಸದೃಶಮಿದು |  
\*ಪ್ರತತಮತಿ ಸುಕವಿಗದಿತಂ (ಗಡ.)ವೃತ್ತಂ

|| ೨ ||

ಅರ್ಷಭವೃತ್ತಂ--

ಇಂತೊಪ್ಪಿವೃತ್ತತೀಯ ಪಾದಜಾತ ತಂ ಜರಂ |  
ಪ್ರಥಮಾಂಘ್ರವಿರತಿ ಯಾರ್ಷಭಂ ಮನೋಜ್ಞಂ ||  
ಮುಂ ತೋರ್ಪ ವಿರಾಟ್ಟುರಾನ್ವಿತಂ |  
ತ್ರಿತಯಮಪರಚರಣವು ಪೂರ್ವಸದೃಕ್ಷಂ

|| ೩ ||

ಗಾಧಾ--

ವಿಷಮಾಕ್ಷರ ಪಾದಾಧ್ಯಂ ವೈಷಮ್ಯಾದಿ ತೋಟಿ ಪಾದಂಗಳಿಂ |  
ವಿಷಮಾಕ್ಷರ ಮಂಘ್ರಿ ವೈಷಮ್ಯಸಮಾತ್ತಪಾದಂಗಳುಂ |  
ಪೋಷಂ ಗಾಧಾಹ್ವಯಕ್ಕೆ ಭಾಷಾಧ್ಯ ಭಂದೋಂಕಮಪ್ರಾಪ್ತಂ

|| ೪ ||

ಇಂತು ವಿಷಮವೃತ್ತ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ

---

\* ಪ್ರಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ದೋಷವುಂಟು. (ಪ್ರತತ=ವಿನುತ ಎಂದು ತಿದ್ದಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು.)

## ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾರಾದಿಷಟ್ಪ್ರತ್ಯಯ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ.



ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾರಂ—

ಕಂ|| ವೃತ್ತಾಕ್ಷರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳಂ |  
ಬತ್ತರಿಸುರುಗುರುಗಳಾದಿಯದಿಡಿಯೊಳಗಂ ||  
ಮತ್ತಿಸು ಲಘುವಂ ಕ್ರಮದಿಂ |  
ಬತ್ತರೆ ಗುರುಗಳನೆ ಬರೆಗೆ ಲಘುವಪ್ಪಿನೆಗಂ || ೧ ||

ನಷ್ಟಂ—

ಕಂ|| ನಷ್ಟಮನೆರಡಿಂ ಭಾಗಿಸಿ |  
ದೃಷ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸಮನಾಗೆ ಲಘುವು ವಿಷಮದೆ ಗುರುವುಂ ||  
ಪುಷ್ಟಿಸಿಯೊಂದಿಹುನರ್ಧಿಸೆ |  
ಯಿಷ್ಟಂ ಮೊದಲನ್ನಮೆಲ್ಲಮುಂ ತೋರುವಿನಂ || ೨ ||

ಉದ್ದಿಷ್ಟಂ—

ಕಂ|| ಉದ್ದಿಷ್ಟ ವೃತ್ತಪಾದದಿ |  
ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟಾಕ್ಷರದಮೇಲೆ ಯೆರಡರಿನಿಹುಯಲ್ ||  
ಉದ್ದಿಷ್ಟಂ ಲಘು ದ್ವಿಗುಣಗಳ್ |  
ವೇಷ್ಟಿಸಿ ಶತಿಯಿಂದೆ ಗುರುಜಗುಣಕಮದಿಲ್ಲಂ || ೩ ||

ಲಗಕ್ರಿಯ—

ಕಂ|| ಭಂದೋಕ್ಷರಮಿತಕೋಷ್ಟಕೆ |  
ಯೊಂದಂ ಕೂಡಿ ಬರೆ ಕೇತುವಾಕ್ಶ ತಿಯಿಂದಂ ||  
ಹಿಂದಿನಮೇಲಿನ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯು |  
ಸಂಧಿಸ(ಲು) ಗುರುಲಘುವೃತ್ತಿ ಲಗಕ್ರಿಯೆಯಕ್ಕುಂ || ೪ ||

೧	೧				
೧	೨	೧			
೧	೩	೩	೧		
೧	೪	೬	೪	೧	
೧	೫	೧೦	೧೦	೫	೧

ಛಂದೋವೃತ್ತಸಂಖ್ಯೆ—

ರಂ|| ಸಂಧಿಸೆ ಲಗಕ್ರಿಯಾಂಕಮೆ |

ಛಂದೋವೃತ್ತಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಬರುವುದು ನಿಜದಿಂ ||

ಉದ್ದಿಷ್ಟಾಂಕೆಗಳೈಕ್ಯದೆ |

ಒಂದಂ ಸೇರಿಸಲು ಬರ್ಪುದಿದು ವೊಂದುವಿಧಂ

|| ೫ ||

ಇಂತು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾರಾದಿ 1ಪ್ರತ್ಯಯ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ.

— ಗದ್ಯ —

ಇತಿ ಶ್ರೀಮದನುಪಮ ನಿತ್ಯನಿರಂಜನ ಪರಮಾತ್ಮಾರ್ಹದಾರಾಧನಾಪರಮಾನಂದ

ಬಂಧುರ ಗುಣಚಂದ್ರ ವಿರಚಿತಮಪ್ಪ

ಛಂದಸ್ಸಾರದೊಳ್

ದಂಡಕಾದಿ ಸಂಕೀರ್ಣ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ

ಚತುರ್ಥಾಧ್ಯಾಯಂ.

1. ಅಧ್ಯಯೋಗನೆಂಬಾಪ್ರಸಂಗವು ಶ್ರೀಕೃಷ್ಣನ ವಿವರಣವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಹಸ್ತಲಿಖಿತ ಪ್ರತಿಯ ಲೇಖಕನ ಪ್ರಮಾದವೋ? ಅಥವಾ ಕವಿಯೇ ಅದರ ಉಪಯೋಗವು ಅಷ್ಟು ಮುಖ್ಯವಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಮೂಲದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿರುವನೋ ಹೇಳಲು ಶಕ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

## ಪಂಚಮಾಧ್ಯಾಯಂ.

### 1 ತಾಳವೃತ್ತಾದಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ.

ತಾಳಸಾಮಂಗಳ್—

ಕಂ|| ಧ್ರುವತಾಳ ಮಟ್ಟಿತಾಳಂ |

ತ್ರಿವೃಡಂ ರೂಪಕ (ಮು) ಮಷ್ಟ ಜಂ (ಪಂ) ಸೈಕಂ ||

ತೀವ್ರವುಮಿಂತೇಬುವಿಧಂ |

ಸೇವಿಸು ವರವೃತ್ತ ಬಂಧರಚನೆಗಳಿಂದಂ

|| ೧ ||

1 ಧ್ರುವತಾಳಂ—

ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯಂ-ಮತು ದಶಮನು + ಯತಿದಶ + ಗತಿಕಲೆ |

ವಿತತ ಚರಣ + ಮಿತಧ್ರುವ + ವೃತ್ತಂ

|| ೨ ||

ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯಂ-ಜಿತಮನಸಿಜ + ಹತದು + ಸ್ಫುತಿಚಯ |

ಮತಿಯಕುಡುಗೆ + ನುತಜಿನ + ನಾಥಂ

|| ೩ ||

2 ಮಟ್ಟಿತಾಳಂ—

ಪುಟ್ಟಿದಗತಿ + ರಸದಶ್ವಮಟ್ಟಿದ + ಕಲೆ ಯಲಯತಿ |

ಬಿಟ್ಟುಗೆ + ದಶ + ಮಾತ್ರೆಯು + ಮಟ್ಟಾಭಿಧಂ ವೃತ್ತಂ

|| ೪ ||

3 ತ್ರಿಪುಟತಾಳಂ—

ತ್ರಿಪುಟ + ವೃತ್ತದಿ + ಸಪ್ತ + ಕಲೆಗಳು |

ಒಪ್ಪು + ತಿರ್ಪುಗೆ + ತ್ರಿಪುರ + ನಗಯತಿ

|| ೫ ||

4 ರೂಪಕತಾಳಂ—

ಯುಗ + ರಸಯತಿ | ಸೊಗ + ಯಿಸಿ ಬರೆ |

ಬಗೆ + ರೂಪಕ | ಮೊಗೆಯಿಸುಗುಂ

|| ೬ ||

(1) ತಾಳಲಕ್ಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಏಳು ವೃತ್ತಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂಟನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಅದಿಹಾಳ ವೆಂಬುದೊಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ.

5 ಜಂಪಕತಾಳಂ—

ಜಂಪಕಮಿದುನ + ಟ + ಕಲೆ | ಸಪ್ತಾಷ್ಟದೊಳು + ಸು + ಯತಿ |  
ಕಾಪಿಡುನಿಜದಿ + ಸು + ಮತಿ | ಲೋಪಿಸೆ ಖಲತೆ + ಯು + ತಿಳಿ || ೭ ||

6 ಅಷ್ಟತಾಳಂ—

ವರಾಷ್ಟ + ತಾಲಜ + ವೃತ್ತಂ | ಸರೋಜ + ಬಾಂಧವ + ಮಾತ್ರಂ ||  
ಕರೀನ + ವಾರಿಧಿ + ಮಾತ್ರಾ + ಪರೀತ + ಯತಿಯುತ + ಹೃದ್ಯಂ || ೮ ||

7 ಏಕತಾಳಂ—

ಜಲನಿಧಿಯಲಿ ಯತಿ || ಕಲೀಕ | ತಾಳಂ || ೯ ||

8 ಆದಿತಾಳಂ—

ಆದಿಯತಾಳಂ | ವಾರ್ಧಿಸುರಸವನು ||  
ಸಾಧಿತಯತಿಯುಂ | ಬುಧಜನಹೃದ್ಯಂ || ೧೦ ||  
ಇಂತು ತಾಳವೃತ್ತ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ  
— ಮಾತ್ರಾವಿಶೇಷಗಣಂ —

ಮಾತ್ರಾವಿಶೇಷಗಣಂ—

ಕಂ|| ಗುರುವೆರಡಾಗರೆ ದರ್ಶನ |  
ಮೂಝಾಗಲ್ ಬೋಧ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಮಾಗಳು ಚರಿತಂ ||  
ಗುರುವೊಂದಕೆರಡುಲಘವಂ |  
ಪರಿಗಣನೆಗೆ ತರುವುದಿಂತು ಗಣಮಂ ನಿಬುಧರ್ || ೧೧ ||

— ಪ್ರಾಸನಿರ್ಣಯಂ —

ಪ್ರಾಸನಿರ್ಣಯಂ—

ಕಂ|| ಅಂತ್ಯಪ್ರಾಸಮನೊಡರ್ಚುಗೆ |  
ನಿತ್ಯದೊಳಂ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಲ್ಲ ಮಿತರಪ್ರಾಸಂ ||  
ಸತ್ಯಂ ತರಳಾದಿಗಳೊಳ |  
ಮಂತ್ಯಪ್ರಾಸಮೆರಡರೊಳಗಮನ್ಯಮತಂ || ೧೨ ||

ದ್ವಿಪದಿ, ತ್ರಿಪದಿ, ರಗಳೆಗಳ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ

ದ್ವಿಪದಿ—

ದ್ವಿಪದಿ ನನನ ಜ ಗಣಗಳಾಗೆ |  
ದ್ವಿಪರಿಚರಣ ಯಮಕವದಾಗೆ || ೧೩ ||



ತ್ರಿವದಿ(ಡಿ)

ಪ್ರಾಸಗಳು ಮೂಝಾಗಿ | ಲೇಸಿನಿಂ ಬರುತಿರಲು |  
ಮಾಸದೆ ಮಾತ್ರೆಗಳ ತ್ರಿವುಡೆ ತಾನೊಗೆಗುಂ

|| ೧೪ ||

— ರಗಳೆಗಳ —

ಮಂದಾನಿಲ ರಗಳೆ—

ಮಂದಾನಿಲ ರಗಳೆ | ಯುಗಲಾಷ್ಟಕಳೆ

|| ೧೫ ||

ಲಲಿತ ರಗಳೆ—

ವಿಂಶತಿ ಕಲಾಘಟಿಂ | ತಿಳಿಗೆ ಲಲಿತ ರಘಟಿಂ

|| ೧೬ ||

ಉತ್ಸಾಹ ರಗಳೆ—

ಉತ್ಸಾಹ ರಗಳೆ ಜನಪರಿಮಿತಕಳೆ | ವಸುನ್ಮಪಯತಿಗಳೆ

|| ೧೭ ||

ಲಾವಣಿ, ಸೀಸಪದ್ಯ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ

ಲಾವಳಿ(ಣಿ)—ಲಘುಗಳ ಮಿಳಿತವ ಮಾಡಿ | ಕೊನೆಯಲಿ ಗುರುಗಳ ಹೂಡಿ

ಅರ್ಥದ ಸಾರವನ್ನೋದಿ | ಪ್ರಾಸನು ಕೊನೆಯಲಿ ಹೂಡಿ |

ಪಾದಮಿತಿಯ ಬೀಸಾಡಿ | ಲಾವಳಿ (ಣಿ) ಕೃತಿಗಳ ಪಾಡಿ

|| ೧೮ ||

1 ಸೀಸಪದ್ಯಂ—

ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತಊಟುಳು ಯತಿಯು ಸಪ್ತಾಶ್ವಪುರಕಲೆಯು

ಮೊಪ್ಪುವುದು ಪಾದದೊಳು ಸೀಸಾಪ್ಪೆಯು

|| ೧೯ ||

— ಗದ್ಯ —

ಇತಿ ಶ್ರೀಮದನುಸುಮ ನಿತ್ಯನಿರಂಜನ ಪರಮಾತ್ಮಾರ್ಹದಾರಾಧನಾಪರಮಾನಂದ

ಬಂಧುರ ಗುಣಚಂದ್ರಕವಿ ವಿರಚಿತ

ಛಂದಸ್ಸಾರದೊಳ

ತಾಳಾದಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಂ ಪಂಚಮಾಧ್ಯಾಯಂ

|| ಛಂದಸ್ಸಾರಂ ಸಮಾಪ್ತಂ ||

1. ಇದು ತೆಲುಗುಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವೃತ್ತವು. ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರಾಚೀನ ಗ್ರಂಥಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇದರ ಪ್ರಯೋಗವಿಲ್ಲ. ೧೯-ನೆ, ೨೦-ನೆಯ ಶತಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬಿಬ್ಬರು ಅಧುನಿಕ ಕವಿಗಳು ಇದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ತೋರುವುದು. ಕಿಟ್ಟಲ್ ಸಾಹೇಬರು ಮುದ್ರಿಸಿರುವ ಛಂದೋಂಬುಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ, ಈಶ್ವರ ಕವಿಯ ಕವಿಜಿಹ್ವಾ ಬಂಧನದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇದರ ಸುಳಿವುಂಟು.

## ON PAMPA'S WORKS

By

H. SESA AYYANGAR

*Junior Lecturer in Kannada.*

This is a continuation of the article which appeared in the previous number of the "Annals." In this the meaning of the word 'Kirāta.' is further discussed.



ತತೋ ದದರ್ಶ ರುಚಿರಂ ಕೈಲಾಸಶಿಖರಪ್ರಭಮ್ |  
ರಾಮವೇಶ್ವ ಸುಮಂತ್ರಸ್ತು ಶಕ್ರವೇಶ್ವಸಮಪ್ರಭಮ್

|| ೩೨ ||

.....  
.....

ಮಹಾಮೇಘಸಮಪ್ರಖ್ಯಮುದಗ್ರಂ ಸುವಿಭೂಷಿತಮ್

|| ೪೦ ||

ನಾನಾರತ್ನ ಸಮಾಕೀರ್ಣಂ 1ಕುಬ್ಜಕೈರಾತಕಾವೃತಮ್

|| ೪೧ ||

ಎಂದು ವಾಲ್ಮೀಕಿಮಹರ್ಷಿಗಳು ಕಿರಾತ ಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀರಾಮಚಂದ್ರನ ಅರಮನೆಯ ವರ್ಣನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವರು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಚಸ್ಪತ್ಯ ನಿಘಂಟುಕಾರನು ಹೇಳುವಂತೆ ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ವ್ಯಾಧರು ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಅಲ್ಪತನುಗಳು (ಭಯಸಂಕೋಚಿತ ತನುಗಳು) ಎಂಬ ತಾತ್ಪರ್ಯಾರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಈ ಶಬ್ದದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಲು—ರತ್ನಾವಳಿನಾಟಕದಂತೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಭಯಸಂಕೋಚಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣವೂ ಇಲ್ಲದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಕೇವಲವಾಗಿ ಸಹಜವಾಗಿರುವ ಅಲ್ಪತನುಗಳು ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನೇ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದು. ರಾಮಾಯಣಕ್ಕೆ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾನವನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿರುವವರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬರಾದ—ಶ್ರೀಗೋವಿಂದರಾಜರೆಂಬವರು—“ಕುಬ್ಜಕೈರಾತಕಾವೃತಂ” ಎಂಬ ಭಾಗಕ್ಕೆ ಹೀಗೆ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾನಮಾಡಿರುವರು—

ಕಿರಾತಾನಾಂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಶರೀರಾಣಾಂ ಸಮೂಹಃ—ಕೈರಾತಂ—ಕೈರಾತಮೇವ ಕೈರಾತಕಂ—ಪೃಶ್ನಿರಲ್ಪತನುಃ ಪ್ರೋಕ್ತಃ ಕಿರಾತಸ್ತ ಚ ಕಥ್ಯತೇ— (ಇತಿ ಹಲಾಯುಧಃ)

ಎಂದು ಸಹಜವಾದ ಅಲ್ಪತನುಗಳು ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನೇ ಹೇಳಿರುವರಲ್ಲದೆ, ವ್ಯಾಧರು ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ ಅವರೇ ಅಲ್ಪತನುಗಳು ಆಗಿದ್ದರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾತೃವೂಕೂಡ—

ಕುಬ್ಜೈಃ, ಕಿರಾತಾನಾಂ—ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಶರೀರಾಣಾಂ ಸಮೂಹೈರಾವೃತಂ, ಯದ್ವಾ ಕುಬ್ಜೈಃ ಕೈರಾತಕೈಃ ಕಿರಾತಸಮೂಹೈಶ್ಚ ಅವೃತಂ—

ಎಂದು ಅಲ್ಪಶರೀರಗಳು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವರಲ್ಲದೆ ವ್ಯಾಧರು ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವರಲ್ಲದೆ ಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾತೃವು—

“ಕುಬ್ಜಕೈರಪಿ ಚಾವೃತಂ” ಎಂಬ ಪಾಠವನ್ನು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಿ—ಕುಬ್ಜಕೈಃ ಕುಬ್ಜೈಃ ದಾಸೈಃ—ಎಂದು ಕುಬ್ಜ ಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಪೂರ್ವವಾಗಿರುವ ದಾಸ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳಿರುವರು.

1. ಕುಬ್ಜಕೈರಪಿಚಾವೃತಮ್ (ಕ-ಖ) ಕುಬ್ಜವಾಮನನಿಶಾವೃತಮ್—ಎಂಬ ಪಾಠಾಂತರಗಳೂ ಉಂಟು. ಆದರೆ ಇವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕೈರಾತಕ ಶಬ್ದಾರ್ಥಸ್ಥೂರ್ತಿಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಮಾರ್ಪಡಿಸಿದ ಪಾಠಾಂತರಗಳಿರಬಹುದು.

2. ಇವರ ಕಾಲ ಸು. ೧೪-ನೆಯ ಶತಮಾನವಿರಬಹುದು.

ಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬರು ಕುಬ್ಜವಾಮನಿಕಾವೃತಂ-ಎಂಬ ಪಾಠವನ್ನು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಿ-ಕುಬ್ಜರೂ, ವಾಮನರೂ (ಅಲ್ಪತನುವಿಶೇಷಾಃ) ಇದ್ದರೆಂದು ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾನಮಾಡಿರುವರು.

ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮೂರು ಪಾಠಗಳನ್ನೂ ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸುವುದರಿಂದ ಶ್ರೀರಾಮಚಂದ್ರನ ಅಂತಃಪುರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಬ್ಜ, ಕಿರಾತ, ವಾಮನ ಎಂಬ ಮೂರುಬಗೆಯ ಅಲ್ಪತನುಗಳಿದ್ದರೆಂದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗುವುದಲ್ಲದೆ ಬೇಡರು (ವ್ಯಾಧರು) ಇದ್ದರೆಂದು ಹೇಗೂ ಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಸುಮಾರು ಕ್ರಿ. ಶ. ೫-೬ನೆಯ ಶತಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಬಾಣಭಟ್ಟನು ತನ್ನಿಂದ ರಚಿತವಾದ ಕಾದಂಬರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾರಾಪೀಡ ಮಹಾರಾಜನ ಸುಟ್ಟದರಸಿಯಾದ ವಿಲಾಸವತಿಯು ಪುತ್ರನನ್ನು (ಚಂದ್ರಾಪೀಡನನ್ನು) ಪ್ರಸವಿಸಿದ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಕೆಯ ಅಂತ್ಯಪುರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂತೋಷ ಕೋಲಾಹಲವನ್ನು ವರ್ಣಿಸುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಿರಾತ ಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವನು.

“ತಸ್ಮಿ ಜಾತೇ ಸರಭಸಮಿತಸ್ತತಃ ಪ್ರಧಾವಿತಸ್ಯ ಪರಿಜನಸ್ಯ ಚರಣಶತಸಂಕ್ಷೋಭ ಚಲಿತಕ್ಷಿತಿತಲೋ ಭೂಪಾಲಾಭಿಮುಖಪ್ರಸೃತಸ್ಥಲದ್ಗತಿಕಂಚುಕಿ ಸಹಸ್ರಃ, ಜನಸಮ್ಮರ್ದ ನಿಷ್ಪಿಷ್ಯಮಾಣ ಪತಿತ ಕುಬ್ಜ ವಾಮನ ಕಿರಾತ ಗಣಃ.....ರಾಜಕುಲೇ ದಿಷ್ಟಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಸಂಭ್ರಮೋ ಮಹಾನಾಸೀತ್.”

ಇದರ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾತೃವು—

ಜನೇತಿ-ಜನಾನಾಂ ಸಮ್ಮರ್ದೀನ (ಜನಗಳ ಒತ್ತಾಟದಿಂದ) ನಿಷ್ಪಿಷ್ಯಮಾಣಾಃ-ಪೀಡ್ಯಮಾಣಾಃ, ಅತವನ ಪತಿತಾಃ (ಹಿಸುಕಲ್ಪಟ್ಟವರೂ ಅದರಿಂದಲೇ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಬಿದ್ದವರೂ ಆದ) ಯೇಷಾಂ ಶಿರೋಧಿ ಪೃಷ್ಟಿಸಾದಂ ಲಕ್ಷಣೋಪೇತಂ ನ ಭವತಿ (ಯಾರ ಕತ್ತು ಪೃಷ್ಟಿ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾಲು ಸರಿಯಾದ ಲಕ್ಷಣದಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿಲ್ಲವೋ) ಮತ್ತು ಸೃಷ್ಟ್ಯದರ ಹೃದಯಂ ಚ ಸುಲಕ್ಷಣಂ ಸ್ಯಾತ್ (ಪೃಷ್ಟಿ, ಹೊಟ್ಟೆ, ಎದೆ ಇವು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಲಕ್ಷಣದಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿದೆಯೋ) ತೇ ಕುಬ್ಜಾಃ (ಅವರು ಕುಬ್ಜರೆಂದು ವ್ಯವಹರಿಸಲ್ಪಡುವರು.) ಎತ್ತವರೂ ತಾಸ್ತು ವಾಮನಾಃ-(ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಲಕ್ಷಣವುಳ್ಳವರು.) ವಾಮನರು, (ಇದರಿಂದ ಅವಯವ ವಿಕಾರದಿಂದಕೂಡಿ ಕುಳ್ಳರಾಗಿರುವವರು, ಕುಬ್ಜರು, ವಾಮನರು ಎಂದು ತಾತ್ಪರ್ಯವು.) ಕೇವಲಂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪತನವಃ-ಕಿರಾತಾಃ-(ಕೇವಲ ಅಲ್ಪ ಶರೀರವುಳ್ಳವರು ಕಿರಾತರು.)-“ಕಿರಾತಃ ಸ್ಯಾದಲ್ಪತನೌ ಭೂನಿಂಬೇ ಮ್ಲೇಚ್ಛಭೇದಯೋಃ-ಸ್ತ್ರಿಯಾಂ ಚಾಮರಧಾರಿಣ್ಯಾಂ ಕುಟ್ಟಿನೀದುರ್ಗಯೋರಪಿ” ಇತಿ ಅನೇಕಾರ್ಥಕೋಶಃ-ತೇಷಾಂ ಗಣಃ-ಸಮುದಾಯೋಯಸ್ಥಿ ಸಃ (ಅವರಗುವು ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವಸಂಭ್ರಮದಲ್ಲಿದೆಯೋ ಅದು)-ಎಂದು ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಲ್ಪತನು ಎಂಬ ಸಹಜವಾದ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿರುವನಲ್ಲದೆ ವ್ಯಾಧ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಭಯಲೇಶಕ್ಕೂ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದ ಸಂತೋಷ ಮಹೋತ್ಸವಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಚಸ್ಪತ್ಯಕಾರನು ಹೇಳುವಂತೆ ಅಲ್ಪತನುಗಳು ಎನ್ನುವ ಅರ್ಥಕ್ಕೆ ಭಯಸಂಕೋಚಿತ ತನುಗಳೆಂದು ಭಾವವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಲು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪವೂ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿಯೇ ತೋರುವುದಲ್ಲದೆ ಕಿರಾತರು(ವ್ಯಾಧರು)ಎಂಬರ್ಥಕ್ಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪವೂ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂತಃಪುರದ ಜನಸಮ್ಮರ್ದದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಕೆಳಗೆ ಬಿದ್ದು ಒದ್ದಾಡುವ ಕಿರಾತರು

ಕಾವಲಿಗಾಗಿದ್ದ ವ್ಯಾಧರೇ ಆಗುವುದಾದರೆ, ಹೊರಗೆ ಕಾವಲಿಗಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಬಲಶಾಲಿಗಳೂ, ಒರಟರೂ ಆದ ವ್ಯಾಧರು ಅಂತಃಪುರದ ಸ್ತ್ರೀ ಪಂಡ ಕಂಚುಕಿಪ್ರಾಯವಾದ ಜನಸಮುದಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಗೂ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆ ಸೇರಿದರೂ ಆ ಜನಸಮ್ಮಂದದಲ್ಲಿ ದುರ್ಬಲರಂತೆ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಬಿದ್ದು ಒದ್ದಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಂತೂ ಯಾವ ಬಗೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಸಂಭವವಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಅಂತಃಪುರದ ಪರಿಜನವಾದ ಕುಬ್ಜವಾಮನರ ಸಹವಾಸದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕಿರಾತರನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಪತನುಗಳಾದ ಕುಳ್ಳರ ಒಂದು ಜಾತಿಯವರೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದೇ ಸರ್ವಧಾ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗಿತ್ತೋರುವುದು.

ಸುಮಾರು ೧೦-ನೆಯ ಶತಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಸೋಮದೇವನೆಂಬ ಜೈನಕವಿಯು ತನ್ನಿಂದ ರಚಿತವಾದ “ಯಶಸ್ವಿಲಕ” ವೆಂಬ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಚಂಪೂಗ್ರಂಥದಲ್ಲಿ-ಈ ಕಿರಾತ ಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಅಂತಃಪುರವರ್ಣನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಯೋಗಿಸಿರುವನು<sup>1</sup>.

ಸಹೇಲಮಂತಃಪುರಪ್ರಚಾರಿಭಿಃ ಅಸ್ತದ್ವರ್ಶನ ಪ್ರವೃತ್ತಮನೋನುರಾಗವೇಗೈಃ  
ಕುಬ್ಜವಾಮನಕಿರಾತ ಕಂಚುಕಿಭಿಃ<sup>2</sup> ಕೃತೇನ ವಿಕೃತಾಲಾಪನರ್ತನಕೈತವೇನ ವಿಕಾಸ್ಯ  
ಮಾನ ಲೋಚನಃ.....

ಇದೇ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾತೃವು (ಸು. ೧೩ನೆಯ ಶತಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದವನು.) ಈ ವಾಕ್ಯವನ್ನು ಹೀಗೆ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾನಿಸಿರುವನು.—ಕುಬ್ಜ.....ಕಂಚುಕಿಭಿಃ (ಕುಬ್ಜವಾಮನಕಿರಾತಕಂಚುಕಿಗಳಿಂದ) ಕೃತೇನ-ವಿಹಿತೇನ (ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ) ವಿಕೃತ.....ಕೈತವೇನ, (ವಿಕೃತಾಲಾಪಾದಿಗಳಿಂದ ಅಹ್ಲಾಢ್ಯಮಾನವಾದ ಕಣ್ಣುಗಳುಳ್ಳವನಾಗಿ, ಎಂದು ವಾಕ್ಯಾನ್ವಯವನ್ನು ಬರೆದು ಬಳಿಕ ಕುಬ್ಜಾದಿ ಪದಗಳ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನೂ, ಸಮಾಸವನ್ನೂ ಹೀಗೆ ವಿವರಣೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವನು. ಕುಬ್ಜಃ-ನ್ಯುಬ್ಜಃ=ಗಡುಲಪರ್ಯಾಯಾಃ, ( ಬೆನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಗಂಟುಳ್ಳ ಗೂನರಿಗೆ ಸಮಾನರಾದವರು ) ವಾಮನಾಶ್ಚ-ಖರ್ವಾಃ=ಹ್ರಸ್ವ ಪರ್ಯಾಯಾಃ, ( ಕುಳ್ಳರಜಾತಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದವರು ) ನಿಖರ್ವಾಶ್ಚ ಖದೂರಾಃ ಕಥ್ಯಂತೇ (ಇವರು ನಿಖರ್ವರೆಂದೂ, ಖದೂರರೆಂದೂ ಕರೆಯಲ್ಪಡುವರು) ಕಿರಾತಾಃ-ಭಿಲ್ಲ ವೇಷಾಃ (ವ್ಯಾಧವೇಷಧಾರಿಗಳು) ಕಂಚುಕಿನಶ್ಚ-ಬುದ್ಧಾಂಡಾಃ, “ ಕುಬ್ಜ.....ಕೈತವೇನ=ಕುಬ್ಜವಾಮನ.....ಕಂಚುಕಿನಾಂ-ವಿಕೃತಾಲಾಪನರ್ತನ-ಕೈತವಂ ತೇನ. ) ತತ್ರ ಕುಬ್ಜಾನಾಂ ವಿಕೃತಂ-ವಿಚಿತ್ರಕೃತಂ (ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಬ್ಜರ ವಿಚಿತ್ರ ಕೆಲಸವು) ವಾಮನಾನಾಂ ಆಲಾಪಂ (ವಾಮನರ ಮಾತುಗಳು) ಕಿರಾತಾನಾಂ-ಭಿಲ್ಲವೇಷಧಾರಿಣಾಂ,ನರ್ತನಾನಿಚ(ಕಿರಾತರೆಂದರೆ ಭಿಲ್ಲವೇಷಧಾರಿಗಳ ನರ್ತನಗಳು)ಕಂಚುಕಿನಾಂ ಕೈತವಂ (ಕಂಚುಕಿಗಳ ಮೋಸ) ಏತೇಷಾಂ ಸಮಾಹಾರಃ=.....ಕೈತವಂ ತೇನ

1. ಪು. ೧೭.. (ನಿರ್ಣಯಸಾರ-ಮುಂಬಯಿ ಮುದ್ರಣ.) 2. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಬ್ಜ, ವಾಮನ, ಕಿರಾತರೊಡನೆ ಕಂಚುಕಿಗಳೂ ಸೇರಿರುವರು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಇವರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ನಿಯತವಾದ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಕಾದಂಬರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಕಂಚುಕಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ವಸ್ತಪದವಾಗಿ ವಿಂಗಡಿಸಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲದೆ, ಕುಬ್ಜವಾಮನ ಕಿರಾತಪದದೊಡನೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ದ್ವಂದ್ವಸಮಾಸ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ.

ಕುಬ್ಜವಾಮನ.....ಕೃತವೇನ ವಿಕಾಸ್ಯಮಾನ ಲೋಚನಃ-ಉಲ್ಲಾಸ್ಯಮಾನ ನೇತ್ರಃ, ಎಂದು ಕುಬ್ಜ ಮೊದಲಾದ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಬಗೆಯವರಿಗೂ ಅಂತಃಪುರದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಕೃತಾಲಾಪ ಮೊದಲಾದ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಬಗೆಯ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನೂ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾನಮಾಡಿರುವನು. ಇದರಿಂದ ಕಿರಾತ ಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಂತಃಪುರದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿನೋದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನರ್ತನ ಮಾಡುವ ಬೇಡರ ವೇಷವನ್ನು ಧರಿಸಿರುವ ಜನಗಳು ಎಂಬುದು ಈತನು ಹೇಳುವ ಅರ್ಥವು. ವಿಚಾರಶೀಲರಿಗೆ ಈ ವಿವರಣವು ಅಷ್ಟು ಸುರಸವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ವಿಕೃತಾಲಾಪನರ್ತನಕೃತವೇನ-ಎಂಬಲ್ಲಿ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಪದಗಳಿರುವುದರಿಂದಲೂ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಕುಬ್ಜವಾಮನಕಿರಾತಕಂಚುಕಿಗಳು ಎಂಬ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಪದಗಳೇ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದಲೂ ಈತನು ಯಾಥಾಸಂಖ್ಯವಿವಕ್ಷಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಮೊದಲಿನ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಪದಗಳೊಡನೆ ಹಿಂದಣ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಪದಗಳನ್ನು ಯಥಾಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿ ಅರ್ಥ ಹೇಳಿರುವನು. ವಾಸ್ತವವಾಗಿ ಈ ಹಿಂದಣ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಪದಗಳ ಅರ್ಥವು ಕುಬ್ಜಾದಿಗಳ ಕೆಲಸವಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಈ ಕುಬ್ಜಾದಿಗಳು ಅಂತಃಪುರದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿನೋದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಿಯತರಾದವರು. ಇದರಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾಥಾಸಂಖ್ಯವನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಮೊತ್ತದಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಬ್ಜಾದಿಗಳ ವಿಕೃತಾಲಾಪ ವಿಕೃತವಾಗಿ ಮಾತಾಡೋಣ, ನರ್ತನ, ಕುಣಿಯೋಣ ಇವೇ ಮೊದಲಾದ ಹಾಸರನಕ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳ ಕೃತವೇನ-ವ್ಯಾಜದಿಂದ ಉಂಟಾದ ಸಂತೋಷದಿಂದ ಅರಳಿದ ಕಣ್ಣುಳ್ಳವನು ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸುರಸವಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಈ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾಕಾರ ನಾದರೋ ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದದ ಅಲ್ಪತನು ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಯದೇ-ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿರುವ ವ್ಯಾಧರು ಎಂಬರ್ಥಕ್ಕೆ ಅಂತಃಪುರ ವರ್ಣನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಮಂಜಸ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದು ಲಕ್ಷಣೆಯಿಂದ ಕಿರಾತವೇಷಧಾರಿಗಳು ಎಂದು ವಿವರಿಸಿರುವನು. ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ವೇಷಧಾರಿ ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಕುಡುವ ಯಾವುದಾದರೊಂದು ಪದ ಅಥವಾ ಪ್ರತ್ಯಯದ ಸಂಸರ್ಗವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಕಿರಾತ ವೇಷಧಾರಿಗಳು ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥಹೇಳುವುದು ಅಸಂಬಂಧ ಪ್ರಲಾಪವಾಗುವುದು.—ಇವನಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಕಿರಾತಶಬ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಲ್ಪತನುಗಳು ಎಂಬರ್ಥವು ಗೊತ್ತಿದ್ದರೂ ರತ್ನಾವಳಿ ನಾಟಕವೊಂದರ ಪ್ರಯೋಗವನ್ನೇ ಆಶ್ರಯಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ಪ್ರಕರಣಬಲದಿಂದ ವ್ಯಾಧರು ಎಂಬರ್ಥವನ್ನು ಬಿಡದೆ ಅಲ್ಪತನು ಎಂಬರ್ಥದ ಸಾಮಂಜಸ್ಯಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ವ್ಯಾಧರು ಭಯಸಂಕೋಚಿತತನುಗಳಾದರು ಎಂದು ಉಪಪತ್ತಿ ಕಲ್ಪನೆಮಾಡಿರುವ ವಾಚಸ್ಪತ್ಯ ನಿಘಂಟುಕಾರನ ಬುದ್ಧಿ ವೈಶದ್ಯವು ವಿಚಿತ್ರತರವಾದುದು; ಪ್ರಕೃತದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾತ್ಯವು ಈ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಕ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾಥಾಸಂಖ್ಯವನ್ನು ವಿವಕ್ಷಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಕಿರಾತ ಶಬ್ದದೊಡನೆ ನರ್ತನಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿ ಬೇಡರು ನರ್ತನಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಲು ಮನಸ್ಸು ಒಪ್ಪದೆ ಬೇಡರ ವೇಷವನ್ನು ಧರಿಸಿದವರು ನರ್ತನಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು ಎಂಬರ್ಥವು ಬರುವಂತೆ ವಿವರಿಸಿರುವನು. ನರ್ತನ ಮಾಡಲು ಬೇಡರ ವೇಷವನ್ನೇ ಧರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ನಿಯಮವುಂಟೇ? ಈ ವಿಧವಾದ ಕವಿ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯ ವರ್ಣನವಾಗಲಿ, ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರವಾಕ್ಯವಾಗಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಿಯಾದರೂ ಇರುವುದೇ? ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಅರ್ಥವು ಈ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾತ್ಯವಿನ ಸ್ವಕವೋಲಕಲ್ಪಿತವಲ್ಲದೆ ಬೇರಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ವ್ಯಾಖ್ಯಾತ್ಯವು—ಅರಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಕಿರಾತರು ವ್ಯಾಧರೆಂದೂ, ಅವರು ಕಾವಲಿಗಾಗಿದ್ದರೆಂದೂ

# MĀVĀRATAM PAṬṬU

By

DR. CHELNAT ACHYUTA MENON, PH.D. (LONDON).

*Head of the Department of Malayalam.*

This is a ballad based on 'Mahabharata' in which the anonymous author narrates the story of the Pāṇḍavas with considerable local colouring.

The Introduction discussing its contents, literary and linguistic importance will be printed in the next issue in which the remaining portions will appear.





മാവാരതം പാട്ട് .

MĀVĀRATAM PĀTTU

EDITED BY

DR. CHELNAT ACHYUTA MENON, PH.D. (LONDON),

Head of the Department of Malayālam

പാട്ട്<sup>1</sup>  
ഇതു

ഹര! ഹര! ശിവ! ശിവ! ശിവശങ്കര! ഹാ!  
ശിവ! നാരായണ! ശിവശങ്കരരെ!  
ഹരി, നമസ്തവായസ്സുരം വാഴുക! വാഴുക!  
മൂന്നാകം തൃക്കണ്ണിൽ പുറന്നതോരു  
ശ്രീഭദ്രകാളിയമ്മമാതാവിന്റെ<sup>1</sup>  
ഓമനപുകൾകഥ പാടുമ്പോഴ്  
എന്തരുവേ! എന്റെ ആശാനേ!  
വചതുഭാഗം കടികൊണ്ടിരിക്ക എന്ന്,  
തന്മണിതാളത്തിൽ ഉതവിചെയ്തേ  
കഥമൊഴി തെളിയിച്ചിങ്ങനെ തരണമെന്നു  
ചങ്കുകത്തുള്ളതോരു ഇരുൾ നീക്കിയിട്ടു  
വെളി<sup>2</sup> എനിക്കുമോ അമ്മാ തരണമെന്ന്  
പൊന്നുത്തിരുമേനിമാതാവിന്റെ തൃപ്പാദം  
ഓമൽമചൽ കൈതൊഴുതേ!  
മത്തഗജവേഷമോപൂണ്ട മലരടിയോനേ!<sup>3</sup>  
മഹാദേവർ തനിക്കുള്ള പൊൻമകളേ!<sup>4</sup>

1. ആവർത്തിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതു നോക്കുക.

2. വെളിവ്—(ജ്ഞാനം).

3. ഗണപതിയെ ചുമ്പെഴിച്ചു. ഇതിൽ 'മത്തഗജവേഷം' പാട്ടിന്റെ മറുപടി യോജിക്കുന്നില്ല.

4. കാളി.

എങ്കനിയായ് അമുതുവച്ചു തരുന്നതെല്ലാം  
 ആദരവോടുവന്നു പൂജകൊണ്ടു്  
 അപ്പമൊടു അട പൊരിയെ  
 ഇരുണ്ടൊളളം വെളുത്തവൽ  
 വെളുളവലൊടു നല്ല ചെൻകരുമ്പാ<sup>5</sup>വെട്ടി  
 വെട്ടിപ്പഴത്തോടെ ഞാനപ്പഴം, നല്ല  
 പൂവൻപഴത്തോടെ മുന്തിരിങ്ങാപ്പഴവും,  
 നാരങ്ങാ, ചെറിയനാരങ്ങയും,  
 നല്ലവരിക്കപ്പാച്ചുളയും  
 ആനമുഖവൻ ക(ഗ)ണപതിക്ക  
 അമ്പോടുവെച്ചു തെങ്ങൾ കമ്പിടുന്നേ.  
 കൈലീഹരൻ ഹരൻ  
 കണ്ടനും, പുത്രനും കൈലപുരത്തിങ്കൽ  
 കൈലമൂന്നുപുരത്തിങ്കൽ ഗംഗയും,  
 ക്രിസ്തവാളും, കമലങ്ങളും, ശുഭവും,  
 കൂടെ ഏറ്റുന്ന നാന്തകം ചേന്തകം.  
 ചങ്കരൻ ഇങ്ങൊരു സിത്തുതിപൂണ്ടു്  
 മണ്ടിവരും ചിലനേരമെല്ലാം  
 മായാകണപതി എന്നുള്ളിൽ വന്നുനിന്നു വിളയാടു്.  
 ഒത്തുവരും പുയിലു് ഒത്തുവരും അൻപതിലൊന്നു്  
 അതു എഴുന്നവരും ഒത്തുചവിട്ടിനടന്ന കുറവെ!  
 ഏറുക ഞങ്ങളുടെ പന്തലിലെ!  
 കണ്ടിച്ചുവെട്ടി (അമ്മ) കരളെപ്പുളർന്നിട്ടു  
 കാലനു പാൽകടം വെച്ചുവളെ!<sup>6</sup>  
 ഭാവിച്ചുനിന്ന ഭയങ്കരി അമ്മെ!  
 ഭദ്രകാളിയെ കൈതൊഴുന്നേൻ.

5. ചെന്തെങ്ങിളന്നീർ. (മേലും)

6. കൈലാസത്തിന്റെ സംസ്കൃതരൂപം. 'തെൻകൈലവന്നാശോഭയം' നോക്കുക.

7. പുകൾ. പുകിൽ—വൃക്ഷം. പുകഴിൽ—മോലം.

8. ഒരുക്കണക്കെന്ന കഥയെ സൂചിപ്പിക്കുന്നു.

വൃത്തം.

നക്കെ! നക്കെ!<sup>9</sup> നരം(ൽ)പൊരുളെ!  
 നാരായ് നല്ലനടപ്പിനു നക്കെ!<sup>10</sup>  
 നാമതിലഴുകിയ തേനൊടുപാൽ  
 പാലൊടു പഴ അമുതുണ്ടവളെ!  
 മുത്തുനിറത്തിനു മുപ്പുവിഴത്തിൽ  
 മുത്തണികൊങ്ക<sup>11</sup> മുലക്കിടചാത്തി  
 എത്രയുംപുകൾ ഏകനിറത്തിൽ  
 എന്മനത്തുക്കുമൊക്കെ യമത്തി  
 ബുദ്ധിതെളിഞ്ഞു കനികൾ<sup>12</sup> തരുമ്പോൾ  
 അത്തലൊഴിക്ക കറുവുഅമ്മെ!  
 അത്തലൊഴിച്ചു അടിയന്നുടെ നാവിൽ  
 ഒതുവിളങ്ങു സരസ്വതിയെ!  
 തിരുവപ്പം ഏതുവരും ഗണനാഥ!  
 ദീപംവിളങ്ങുവൻ ഉള്ളതെല്ലാം  
 തീരായി നല്ല സരസ്വതി നക്കെ!  
 സുഖമൊടുവാഴ്ച എൻ പന്തലിൽ  
 കാർക്കഴൽ നല്ല സരസ്വതി നക്കെ!  
 എന്നുള്ളിൽ വന്നുനിന്നു വിളയാടുക.

9. സ്രീ; ഇവിടെ ദേവി.

10. നല്ലനടപ്പിനു നാരായ് = അടിസ്ഥാനമായി. ബുദ്ധി ശരിയാണെങ്കിലേ നടവടി നന്നാകുമുള്ളൂ.

11. ആവത്തി.

12. കനിവ് എന്നും ഒരു പാഠം കണ്ടുന്നു. കന്യകമാർ എന്നർത്ഥം.

കുരുനാട്ടിലും അമ്മ കാന്താരിയെ,  
കുരുനാട്ടിലും അമ്മ കുന്തിഭേവിയെ,  
കുരുനാട്ടിലും അമ്മ കാന്താരിയെ  
(ഭ)ത്തെടുത്തതിലല്ലോ നൂറുപേർ.  
കുരുനാട്ടിലമ്മ കുന്തിഭേവിയെ  
കുന്തിഭേവിപെറ്റ മക്കളും അഞ്ചു  
അഞ്ചിൽ ഇളയതോരകുഞ്ചു ഭീമൻ<sup>2</sup>  
മുപ്പത്തിമൂന്നല്ലോ നല്ല തിരുവയസ്സ്  
മുപ്പത്തിമൂന്നു നല്ല തിരുവയസ്സിലല്ലോ  
അഞ്ചുതല അഞ്ചുപത്തിയും ഉള്ള  
അഞ്ഞനനാകത്താൻ<sup>3</sup> കടിച്ചുതന്നെ  
കടിച്ചുതന്നെ ഇന്നു മരിക്കണമെന്ന്  
ജാതകത്തിൻഫല മങ്ങനെതന്നെ.

കുരുനാട്ടിലു മമ്മ കാന്താരിയെ  
നൂറ്റിലിലിയതോരു തുച്ചുളാ<sup>4</sup>കുഞ്ഞെ  
കുഞ്ഞിനേയും ഇന്നു വിളിച്ചു കള്ളി  
നിന്റെ ആയതോരു ഉടപ്പിറപ്പ്  
അഞ്ചു നല്ലതോരു പാണ്ഡവന്മാരു  
കുരുനാടുമോ ഉററവളർ ശീമക്കു  
ഒന്നുപോലെ അവർ വാണിരിക്കുന്നു.  
'ഓണം'<sup>5</sup> കാണെതിനു പോയിവരണമെ  
ഇന്നുംകേളു എന്റെ കന്നിയെ, കുഞ്ഞെ!

- 
1. ശരിയായ പ്രസവമല്ലാത്തതുകൊണ്ട് ഇരുവരും ഉപയോഗിച്ചതായിരിക്കണം.
  2. ഭീമനെ എന്തുകൊണ്ടാണ് ഇളയവനാക്കിയത് എന്നറിയുന്നില്ല.
  3. പാമ്പുകളിൽ ഒരു വകയേതുമായി 'അഞ്ചനമണിനാൾ'മെന്നെന്നാണ് നിറംകൊണ്ടാണ് ഇരുപേർ വന്നിട്ടുള്ളത്.
  4. ഒറ്റുള.
  5. ഇവിടെ പ്രതാപവീര്യങ്ങൾ എന്നർത്ഥം. 'ഓണം'മഹോത്സവത്തിനു പശ്ചാത്തോഴമായിട്ടുണ്ടല്ലോ.

‘കൊള്ളാം കൊള്ളാം അമ്മ മണിമാതാവെ!  
 ‘ഓണം’ കാണമതിനു പോകണമെങ്കിൽ  
 ആ നാട്ടിലില്ലാത്ത വകതന്നാലു്  
 ‘ഓണം’കണ്ടു ഞാൻ വരുമേ’ എന്ന്.  
 ‘നിനക്കു കൊണ്ടുപോകാനുള്ള തോരുവക  
 ഒരുക്കി ഞാനും ഇന്നും തരുവതുണ്ടു്.’  
 കൂടനാട്ടിലും അമ്മ കാന്താരിയെ  
 മലയിൽ കുറവനെ<sup>6</sup> ഏകിവിളിക്കാം.<sup>7</sup>  
 കുറവനാവുന്നു നിലയുനിന്നു  
 ‘ഇന്നും കേളു എന്റെ കുറവാ കേളു’!  
 അഞ്ചുതല അഞ്ചുപത്തി<sup>8</sup>യുമുള്ള  
 അഞ്ഞനനാകത്താനെപ്പിടിച്ചു നീയെ!  
 ചെമ്പുപാവട്ടി<sup>9</sup>നകത്തടച്ചു  
 വായ്ക്കുട്ടമോ നീയെ, ഇന്നു കെട്ടിയോ ഇന്ന്,  
 അടിയറ കാഴ്ചയായി വയ്ക്കണമെന്ന്  
 കാന്താരിയുടെ കല്പനതന്നെ.’  
 അമ്മൊഴികേട്ടതോരു കുറവനാരു്<sup>10</sup>  
 അവന്റെ നല്ലതോരു കൂരയിൽ<sup>11</sup>വന്ന്  
 ഇരുമ്പുപാറ<sup>12</sup> ഒന്നു കയ്യിലെടുത്തു്  
 നാകം(ഗം) ഇണങ്ങുന്ന മരണെടുത്തു്  
 ചെമ്പുകുടങ്ങലും അങ്ങു എടുത്തുകൊണ്ടു്  
 ചിരട്ടയുമോകൂടെ എടുത്തുകൊണ്ടു്  
 മലകയറിയോ മന്നൻ<sup>13</sup> നടയുകൊണ്ടു്  
 ആദ്യം കണ്ടതോരു പുറം ഇടിച്ചു്

- 
6. കൂടനാട്ടിലും കുറവരുണ്ടു്.
  7. വിളിക്കുകയും.
  8. പടം.
  9. പാവട്ടി=പാമ്പിനെയിടാനുള്ള ഒരുതരം പായ് വട്ടി.
  10. ബഹുവചനം പ്രയോഗിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു.
  11. കിരിച്ചുകൊണ്ടുള്ള പുറ.
  12. കർത്തവടി.
  13. മന്നൻ; രാജാവിനും എളിയവനും ഈ പദം ഉപയോഗിക്കാറുണ്ടു്.

പുററിച്ചു മന്നൻ നോക്കിയപ്പൊഴുത്ത്  
 ആ നാട്ടിലുള്ളതോരു സ്വപ്നങ്ങളുത്ത്  
 റെറപത്തിയല്ലാതെ കണ്ടതും ഇല്ല  
 രണ്ടാമതുമൊരു പുററിച്ചുപ്പൊഴുത്ത്  
 പുററിച്ചു മന്നൻ നോക്കിയപ്പൊഴുത്ത്  
 അഞ്ചുതല അഞ്ചുപത്തിയുമുള്ള  
 അഞ്ഞനനാകത്താനെ കണ്ടതുംകൊണ്ടു്  
 നാകം(ഗം) ഇണങ്ങുന്ന മരന്നെടുത്തു്  
 വീരത്താ<sup>14</sup>നെ വേഗംമയക്കി മന്നൻ  
 ചെമ്പുപാവട്ടിത്തിനകത്തുമാക്കി  
 ചിരട്ടുകൊണ്ടു മന്നൻ കുടവുമൂടി  
 വായ്ക്കുട്ടുമോ ഇന്നു കെട്ടിയോവേഗം  
 വീരത്താനെ ഇന്ന് തലയിലെടുത്തു്  
 അവന്റെ നല്ലതോരു ക്രൂരക്കല്ലോ  
 കൊണ്ടുചെന്നുടനെ സൂക്ഷിച്ചുവയ്ക്കാം.  
 അന്നും മന്നനേയും പട്ടിണിയിട്ടു്  
 പിറേറന്നാളും നല്ല പുലർകാലമേ  
 വീരത്താനെ മന്നനെടുത്തുംകൊണ്ടു്  
 കുറവനാരുമെല്ലെ നടയുംകൊണ്ടു്  
 കുരുനാടുമോ ഉററവളർ ശീമക്കു  
 കുറവനാരുചെന്നു നിലയുനിന്നു്.  
 ഏഴാംനില നല്ല മാളികേലിന്റെ  
 മുകളിൽ മാതാവങ്ങിരിക്കുമ്പോഴു്  
 ചെമ്പുപാവട്ടിയും കണ്ടതുംകൊണ്ടു്  
 സന്തോഷവും ഇന്നു പൂണ്ടതുംകൊണ്ടു്  
 മിററാവെളിക്കല്ലോ തിരുമുറത്തു്  
 കാലുകുറുകിയ കനകക്കട്ടിലിന്റെ  
 തന്നിമിയി<sup>15</sup>ലോ വന്നങ്ങിരുന്നുംകൊണ്ടു്  
 'ഇന്നും കേളു് എന്റെ കുറവാ, കേളു്'  
 വായ്ക്കുട്ടുമോ നീയങ്ങഴിക്കുമേഗം'

അമ്മൊഴി കേട്ടതോരു കുറവനാരു്  
 വായ്ക്കെട്ടുമോ ഇങ്ങഴിച്ചപ്പോഴു്  
 വീരത്താനെ ഇന്ന് കണ്ടതുമില്ല.  
 നാകം(ഗം) ഇണങ്ങുന്ന മരുനെടുത്തു്  
 വാലുതൂക്കി മന്നൻ വെളിക്കുവിട്ടു്  
 അന്നോരമല്ലോ വീരത്താനും  
 വാലിനേയുംമെല്ലെ തറയിലൂന്നി  
 അഞ്ചുതല അഞ്ചുപത്തിയെടുത്തു്  
 ആ(ഭേ)ടണതൊരു ആട്ടവും കണ്ടു്  
 കാന്തകാരി<sup>16</sup> ഇന്നു ഭയന്നുംപോയി  
 'ഇന്നും കേളു ഏന്റെ കുറവാ കേളു്'  
 ചെമ്പുപാവട്ടിയിലടക്കുവേഗം  
 അമ്മൊഴി കേട്ടതോരു കുറവനാരു്  
 നാകം(ഗം) ഇണങ്ങുന്ന മരുനെടുത്തു്  
 വീരത്താനെ മന്നൻ മയക്കി വേഗം'  
 ചെമ്പുപാവട്ടിയും കൊണ്ടുവന്നല്ലോ  
 ചെമ്പുപാവട്ടിയിനകത്തടക്ക  
 വായ്ക്കെട്ടുമോകൂടെ കെട്ടിയോവേഗം  
 ആരുംതന്നെ ഇന്നതഴിക്കാതെ  
 കെട്ടിലുമോ ഇന്നു മുത്രയും<sup>17</sup> വയ്ക്കാം  
 കുരുനാട്ടിലും അമ്മ കാന്താരിയെ  
<sup>18</sup>'പണ്ടാരപ്പള്ളി' എന്ന അറതുറന്നു  
 അറയ്ക്കുകത്തുമോവച്ചു പൂട്ടിയോവേഗം  
 പാവട്ടികൊണ്ടുവന്ന കുറവനാക്കു  
 പൊലിവോടു<sup>19</sup> സമ്മാനം കൊടുക്കുന്നല്ലോ,  
 വസ്രദാനവും അന്നു കൊടുക്കുന്നല്ലോ,  
 അന്നദാനവുമന്നു കൊടുക്കുന്നല്ലോ,

16. 'ഇതു' കാന്താരിയെ നീട്ടിയതാണ്.

17. മുദ്ര, മുത്തീര എന്നതാണ് പഴയരൂപം.

18. പണ്ടാരപ്പള്ളിയറ—പണ്ടാരവും, പള്ളിയും രാജപദവിയെ സൂചിപ്പിക്കുന്ന പദങ്ങളാണ്.

19. ധാരാളമായി.



എല്ലാവകയുമോ വാങ്ങിയുകൊണ്ട്  
 വലംകാൽവെച്ച് മന്നൻ വെളിക്കിറങ്ങി.  
 കുറവനായുമോ അന്നു നടയുകൊണ്ട്  
 അന്നും മന്നനെ അവിടെ പട്ടിണിയിട്ട്  
 പിറന്നാളുമോ നല്ല പുലർകാലമേ  
 'ഇന്നുംകേൾക്ക എന്റെ മകളെ കന്നി  
 കരുനാടുമോ ഉറവളർ ശീമക്ക  
 ചെമ്പുപാവട്ടിയും നീ അങ്ങെടുത്തുകൊണ്ട്  
 ഇന്നുതന്നെയോ നീ പോയി വരിക.  
 അമ്മൊഴി കേട്ടതൊരു തുച്ചുക്കുഞ്ഞു്  
 കുളിച്ചുടുത്ത ചമഞ്ഞൊരുങ്ങിവേഗം  
 അന്നഭോജനക്കു<sup>18</sup> ഉണ്ടതായി  
 ഏഴുനല്ലതോരു തോഴിമാരും  
 കൊട്ടു വെടി വാളുമ്പോഴത്തോടെ  
 ഏഴുതോഴിമാരും 'വാക്കുരവ'<sup>19</sup>യും  
 ആഘോഷത്തോടെ തിരിച്ചു അവർ വേഗം,  
 കരുനാടുമോ അവർ വിട്ടിറങ്ങുന്നു.  
 ഒട്ടു പകുതിദൂരം ചെന്നപ്പോഴു്  
 പാഞ്ചാലിയുമന്ന ഭീമസേനനായി  
 പകിടകുളിച്ചോണ്ടങ്ങിരിക്കുമ്പോഴു്  
 എറിഞ്ഞുകിട്ടിയതൊരു പകിടയിലൊക്കെ  
 ഭീമസേനൻ തോല്വി കണ്ടതുമുള്ളു.  
 പകിടയിൽ തോല്വികണ്ടപ്പോഴു്,  
 ചാ(ജാ)തകക്കെട്ടു മെല്ലെ എടുത്തു മന്നൻ  
 ചാതകൊലകൂടെ വായിച്ചല്ലോ.  
 വായിച്ചുപോകൂടെ<sup>20</sup> നോക്കിയപ്പോഴു്  
 മുപ്പത്തിമൂന്നു നല്ല തിരുവയസ്സു്  
 വയസ്സുതന്നെ ഇന്നു തികഞ്ഞുപോയി

20. ആവത്തി.

21. വായിൽ കൈവിരലിട്ടുണ്ടാക്കുന്ന ഒരു ശബ്ദം, മംഗളസൂചകമാണ്.

22. പോകൂടെ, (പരാന്തരം.)

ജാതകത്തിൽകണ്ട പലങ്ങളെല്ലാം  
 പലങ്ങളുമോളുടെ നടന്നിട്ടില്ല  
 അങ്ങനെയോക്കി ഇരിക്കുമ്പോഴു്  
 കൊട്ടു്, വെടി, വാദ്യഘോഷങ്ങളു്  
 ഘോഷങ്ങളുമോ ഇന്ന് കേട്ടപ്പോഴു്  
 അവിടെനിന്നുമോ മന്നൻ നോക്കിയപ്പോഴു്  
 ചെമ്പുപാവട്ടിയുമൊന്നു വരവതുകണ്ടു.  
 'ഇന്നുംകേൾക്ക പാഞ്ചാലിയെ'.  
 തോററാപകിട<sup>23</sup> നീയോ വാരിയോകെട്ടി  
 പഴയപോൽ അങ്ങു് അഴകാൽവച്ചു്  
 തുച്ചട(ള)കഞ്ഞിനേയും തോഴിമാരേയും  
 എതിരേറു നീയെ കൊണ്ടുവരികവേണം.  
 എതിരേറു നീയുമേ കൊണ്ടുവന്നല്ലോ  
 കാരേററുമോ നല്ല കളിത്തിണ്ണക്കു്<sup>24</sup>  
 കാലുകുകിയ നല്ല കനകക്കട്ടിലു് മീതു്  
 അവരെ കൊണ്ടുവന്നു അങ്ങു് ഇരുത്തിയിട്ടു്  
 വെള്ളംകുടിദാഹം കെടുകണം നീയു്'.  
 ഇങ്ങനെയുള്ളതോരു വാക്കുകളെല്ലാം  
 പാഞ്ചാലിയോടു ഭീമൻ പറഞ്ഞുകൊണ്ടു്  
 അങ്ങനെയോ മന്നൻ ഇരിക്കുമ്പോഴു്  
 പാഞ്ചാലിയും ഏഴു് തോഴിമാരോടു്  
 എതിരേറുമോ ഇങ്ങു കൊണ്ടുവരുവാൻ  
 വലംകാലുമോവച്ചു വഴിനടക്കുന്നിതാ.  
 അടുത്തുടനെയെന്നു മുടുകിയപ്പോഴു്  
 'വായ്ക്കുരവ'യും അവർ പൊലിഞ്ഞുകൊണ്ടു്  
 കരുനാടുമോ ഉററവർവളർ ശീമക്കു  
 മിററവെളിക്കോടി കയറിയല്ലോ  
 ബലംപെരിയ തമ്പി ബലഭീമന്റെ  
 പിമ്പിലല്ലോകൊണ്ടു അടിയറവെയ്ക്കാം.

23. തോററായ പകിട.

24. വടക്കൻപാട്ടുകൾ അനുസ്മരിപ്പിക്കുന്നു.

ഭണ്ഡടിനമസ്കാരം<sup>25</sup> വീണതുകൊണ്ട്  
 എഴുന്നേറ്റല്ലോ നിന്നു കൈതൊഴുതേൻ<sup>26</sup>  
 അമ്മൊഴി കേട്ടതോരു ഭീമരാജാവ്  
 'ഇരിക്ക ഇരിക്ക എന്റെ തോഴിമാരെ!  
 ചെമ്പുപാവട്ടി മന്നൻ എടുത്തുകൊണ്ട്  
 പണ്ടാരപ്പള്ളി എന്ന അറ തുറന്ന്  
 അറയ്ക്കുകത്തുമോവെച്ചു പൂട്ടിയുകൊണ്ട്  
 ഭീമസേനനുമോ വന്നങ്ങിരുന്നുകൊണ്ട്  
 വന്നതോരു നല്ല തുച്ചളകളെയും, തോഴിമാർക്കുമോ  
 ഇന്നു ഉണ്ടാതുമായി.  
 അന്നുതന്നെയോ തുച്ചളകളെ  
 പോകാമല്ലോ യാത്രപോലിക്കുന്നു.  
 യാത്ര കന്നിയോ ഇന്നുപോലിച്ചപ്പോൾ  
 'കൊണ്ടുപോക എന്റെ തുച്ചളകളെ'!  
 ഞാൻ ഉണ്ണുന്നതിലൊരു പൊൻതളിക  
 നിനക്കായിട്ടുമോ ഞാനോ തരുന്നതുണ്ട്,  
 ഞാൻ കൈകഴുകുന്നതോരു വെള്ളിക്കിണ്ടി  
 നിനക്കായിട്ടുമോ ഞാനോ തരവതുണ്ട്,  
 എൻകഴുത്തിൽ കിടക്കും മാലയുമൊന്ന്  
 നിനക്കായിട്ടുമോ ഞാനോ തരുന്നതുണ്ട്,  
 ഞാൻ കൈതോർത്തുന്നതോരു പുള്ളിപ്പട്ട്  
 നിനക്കായിട്ടുമേ ഒന്നു തരുന്നതുണ്ട്.'  
 'കൊള്ളാം കൊള്ളാമെന്റെ ഉടുപ്പിറപ്പ്  
 സമ്മാനങ്ങളോ എനിക്കു ഒന്നുവേണ്ട  
 കരുനാടുമോ, ഇന്ന് കരുനാടുമോ,  
 രണ്ടുനാടുമോ ഇന്ന് ഒന്നുതന്നല്ലോ  
 നിങ്ങൾ ഞാററിഞ്ഞുപേരും ഒന്നുപോലെനിക്കു-  
[തന്നെയെന്ന്]  
 പൊലിവോടെ സമ്മാനം വേണ്ടെന്നിരിക്ക

25. അടിയിൽ ഭണ്ഡനമസ്കാരം.

26. പുരുഷപ്രത്യയം തെറ്റി ഉപയോഗിക്കുന്നതിന്നു ഒരുദാഹരണമാണിത്.  
 ഇത് ഭേഷ്യ പുത്തരിയാണെന്നർത്ഥം.

കൊള്ളാം കൊള്ളാം എന്റെ ഉടപ്പിറപ്പ്  
 വന്നതോരു നല്ല തോഴിമാക്കെല്ലാം  
 പരിവട്ടത്<sup>27</sup> അധം കൊടുപ്പിച്ചല്ലോ.  
 വെറില കളിപ്പാക്കു തിന്നുകൊണ്ടു  
 തോഴിമാരേയുളളോ വിളിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു  
 തൊഴുതകുതിനാലെ യാത്രയുചൊല്ലി  
 വലതുകാൽവെച്ചു കന്നി നടയുകൊണ്ടു.  
 അന്നം മന്നനെയോ പട്ടിണിയിട്ടു  
 കൊണ്ടുചെന്നതോരു അഞ്ചാംദിവസം  
 ബലംപെരിയതമ്പി ബലഭീമനും  
 ഒരു തുതുവ<sup>28</sup>നെ ഏകിവിളിക്കാം.  
 വിളിയുകേട്ടു ഓടിവന്നപ്പോഴു്  
 “ഇന്നും കേൾക്കൂ എന്റെ തുതുവാ! കേളു്  
 നിന്നെ വിളിച്ചതോരു കാര്യങ്ങളു്  
 ഞാൻ ചൊല്ലാം എന്റെ തുതുവാ! കേളു്  
 വേഗത്തിലോ നീയോ പോകണം ചെന്ന്  
 വൈരവന്നെന്നതോരു തച്ചവന്റെ  
 പടിപ്പറത്തുമോചെന്നു നിന്നുകൊണ്ടു്  
 തച്ചവന്റെപേരു ചൊല്ലിതന്നെ  
 നീ തന്നെയുമോചെന്നു വിളിക്കവേണം.  
 പണിക്കായുധങ്ങളും എടുത്തുകൊണ്ടു്  
 വെട്ടുകോടാലികൂടെ എടുത്തുകൊണ്ടു്  
 മുഴക്കോലുമോകൂടെ എടുത്തുകൊണ്ടു്  
 തച്ചവനേയും കൊണ്ടുവരിക വേഗം.”  
 അമ്മൊഴി കേട്ടതോരു തുതുവനല്ലോ  
 കാൽമാറിയോ വീണു ഓടുന്നിതാ.  
 തച്ചവന്റെയോരു പടിപ്പറത്തു  
 ചെന്നടനെ നീചനിന്നുകൊണ്ടു  
 തച്ചവന്റെ പേരുചൊല്ലി വിളിച്ചപ്പോഴു്  
 എന്തെന്തെന്ന് അവൻ വിളിയുകേട്ടു്

27. രാജാക്കന്മാരുടേക്കന്ന വസ്ത്രങ്ങൾ.

28. ഒതുവൻ=ഒരുതിന്നാപോകുന്നവൻ (ഓട്ടൻ).

മിററാവെളിശ്ശോടിവന്നപ്പോഴു്  
 'ഇന്നും കേളോ എന്റെ തച്ചവകേളു്!  
 പണിയ്ക്കായുധങ്ങൾ അങ്ങെടുത്തുകൊണ്ടു്  
 കരുനാട്ടിലേക്കു ചെല്ലേണമെന്ന്  
 ഭീമരാജാവിന്റെ കല്പനതന്നെ'  
 അമ്മൊഴികേട്ടതോരു തച്ചവനല്ലോ  
 പണിക്കായുധങ്ങളും എടുത്തുകൊണ്ടു്  
 വെട്ടുകോടാലികൂടെ എടുത്തുകൊണ്ടു്  
 വലംകാൽവച്ചുമോ വഴിനടക്കുന്നല്ലോ  
 കരുനാടുമോ ഉററവളർ ശീമക്കു  
 വന്നടനെ നിലനിന്നുകൊണ്ടു്  
 ഭീമരാജാവിനേയും കണ്ടുകൊണ്ടു്  
 ചെന്നടനെനിന്നു കൈതൊഴുതപ്പോൾ  
 വന്നോടാ, എന്റെ തച്ച(വ)നേ!  
 'വന്നതാം തൈവതിരുവടിവെ!' എന്നു്  
 'ഇരിക്കയോട, എന്റെ തച്ചവനെ!  
 'ഇരിക്കാമല്ലോ തൈവതിരുവടിവെ!'  
 ഇന്നുംകേൾ എന്റെ തച്ചവകേളു്!  
 തെക്കെ നില്ക്കുന്ന നല്ല ചെമ്മരമുണ്ടു്<sup>29</sup>  
 ചെമ്മരം എന്നു വരിക്കുപ്പാവു്  
 മൂടുതന്നെ ഇന്നു മുറിക്കണമെങ്കിൽ  
 വിളക്കും ഗണപതി വേണമെന്ന്  
 നിറപറ നിറനാഴി വേണമെന്ന്  
 ചെങ്കുരുവയുമൊന്നു വേണമെന്ന്  
 കരുനാട്ടിലുള്ളോരു തുതുവൻ  
 എപ്പേരെല്ലാം ഒരുക്കിക്കൊടുക്കുന്നവല്ലോ  
 ഒരുക്കുവടിയല്ലാം വാങ്ങിച്ചല്ലോ.  
 വരിക്കുപ്പാവിന്റെ ഒരു പാകത്തേക്കു്  
 വിളക്കും ഗണപതി വച്ചവൻ  
 നിറപറ നിറനാഴി വച്ചവൻ

ചെങ്കുരുമ്പയ്യം ഒരു വച്ചവനും  
 ഒരുവെടി<sup>30</sup> വച്ചു ഒരുക്കിക്കൊണ്ടു്  
 ഭീമരാജാവിന്റെ മുഖിലും വന്നു്  
 തൊഴുതുടനെ യാത്രചോദിച്ചല്ലോ.  
 വരിക്കുപ്പാവിന്റെ മൂട്ടിലുംചെന്നു്  
 മൂന്നുവലതുവച്ചു നിന്നുകൊണ്ടു്  
 വെട്ടായുധങ്ങൾ അങ്ങെടുത്തുകൊണ്ടു്  
 തൊഴുതിരുത്തിയൊ മന്നൻ വെട്ടുന്നല്ലോ.  
 മൂന്നുവെട്ടുകൾ വെട്ടിയപ്പോഴു്  
 ചിറകളു<sup>31</sup>മൊ ഒരു തെറിച്ചുപ്പോഴു്  
 “നില്ല നില്ലെന്റെ തച്ചവകേളു്!  
 വെട്ടുവാനോ അല്പം വരുട്ടെ എന്ന്  
 മൂന്നുവെട്ടുമോ നീയെ വെട്ടിയതിന്റെ  
 കുറിപരമാർത്തങ്ങൾ പറഞ്ഞല്ലാതെ  
 പ്പാവിനേയോ ഇനി വെട്ടരുതെന്ന്”  
 ‘തിരുമാതേവ! പൊന്നും തമ്പുരാനെ!  
 കുറിപരമാർത്തവും പറഞ്ഞാലല്ലോ  
 എന്റെ തലയെ തട്ടിതെറിപ്പിക്കുമല്ലോ!  
 ‘കേ(ഖ)ഭംവേണ്ടാ എന്റെ തച്ചവാ, കേളു്!  
 കുറിപരമാർത്തമോ നീ പറകവേണം’  
 അമ്മൊഴികേട്ടതോരു തച്ചവനും  
 കുറിപരമാർത്തങ്ങൾ പറയുന്നല്ലോ—  
 ‘കൊള്ളാം, കൊള്ളാം, എന്റെ തമ്പുരാനെ!  
 തെക്കെനില്ലുമോ നല്ല ചെമ്മരമുണ്ടു്  
 ചെമ്മരം എന്ന വരിക്കുപ്പാവു്  
 മൂടുതന്നെയോ ഇന്നു മുറിയുമ്പോഴു്  
 എട്ടുചാണമേ മെല്ലെ അളന്നു കുറിച്ചു  
 എട്ടുമുറിയോ ഒരു മുറിയുമ്പോഴു്

30. അക്കാലത്തു് വെടിയോ? ധനുർച്ചങ്ങിൽ നളികം, ശതാപ്പി എന്നൊക്കെ കാണുന്നുണ്ടു്. അതുകൊണ്ടു് ഇല്ലെന്നു പറഞ്ഞുകൂടാ.

31. ചെറിയ കഷണങ്ങൾ, ചിറകിനെ നീട്ടിയതാണു്.

നാലുപാടുമോവെട്ടി എറിച്ചെ<sup>32</sup>ടുത്തു  
 അകംകടഞ്ഞൊ ഇന്നു പുറംമിനക്കി  
 വഞ്ചിയേലു<sup>33</sup>മൊ ഒന്ന് തീരുമേ ഇന്ന്.  
 വഞ്ചിയേലുമോന്നുമെ കുറതീരുമ്പോൾ  
 വഞ്ചിയേയിലു ഇന്നു പാരപിണം<sup>34</sup>  
 പാരപിണം ഒന്നുമേ കേറുമേ ഇന്ന്  
 ഇങ്ങനെയുള്ളതോരു ലക്ഷണങ്ങളും കുറി-  
 പലവുമോ അടിയൻ കണ്ടതാണ്.’  
 ‘വെട്ടു വെട്ടു എന്റെ തച്ചവാ! കേളു’  
 എടുമറിയുമൊന്നു കുറയുതീർത്തു  
 നാലുപാടുമോവെട്ടി എറിച്ചുവേഗം  
 അകംകടഞ്ഞു നല്ല പുറംമിനക്കി  
 പാരവഞ്ചിയിലൊന്നു കുറതീർത്തപ്പോൾ,  
 തീർത്തതോരു നല്ല തച്ചവൻ  
 പൊലിവോടു സമ്മാനം കൊടുത്തുകൊണ്ടു  
 നല്ലവാക്കുമോചൊല്ലി അയക്കുന്നിതാ.  
 വലംകാൽവച്ചുമാതച്ചൻ വഴിനടന്ന്  
 പിററന്നാളുമെ നല്ല പുലർകാലെ  
 ബലംപെരിയതമ്പി ബലഭീമനും  
 ‘ഇന്നുംകേൾക്ക, എന്റെ പാഞ്ചാലിയെ!  
 അന്നഭോജനങ്ങൾ<sup>35</sup> ഒരുക്കവേണം.’  
 അമ്മൊഴികേട്ടതോരു പാഞ്ചാലിയും  
 അന്നഭോജനങ്ങൾ ഒരുക്കുന്നല്ലൊ  
 ബലംപെരിയതമ്പി ബലഭീമനും  
 ജാതകക്കെട്ടുമെല്ലെ എടുത്തുകൊണ്ടു  
 ജേട്ട(യ്യ)നെയും ഇന്നു വിളിച്ചുടനെ  
 വലംകയ്യാലെ കൊണ്ടുകൊടുക്കുന്നിതാ.  
 പള്ളിവചനങ്ങൾ പൊലിഞ്ഞുകൊണ്ടു

32. തടിയുടെ വെള്ളകളഞ്ഞു ഉരുട്ടുക.

33. ഒരുതരം വഞ്ചി.

34. ഭാരത്തോടുകൂടിയ പിണം—ശവം. വലുതായപിണം എന്നർത്ഥംമാവാം.

35. ആവർത്തി.

'ഇന്നുംകേൾക്ക എന്റെ ഭീമസേനാ, തമ്പി  
 മുപ്പത്തിമൂന്നു നല്ല തിരുവയസ്സിൽ  
 അഞ്ചുതല അഞ്ചുപത്തിയുമുള്ള  
 അഞ്ഞനനാഗത്താൽ കടിച്ചുനിന്നെ  
 വിശംതീണ്ടിയോ ഇന്നു മരിക്കണമെന്ന്  
 ജാതകത്തിൻപലം അങ്ങനെതന്നെ'.  
 ഇന്നും കേൾക്കട്ടെ ഭീമസേനാ, തമ്പി!  
 നക്ഷത്രം ചകഭേവന്മാരു ഇരുപേരും  
 അമ്മ മാതാവു<sup>36</sup> ഭുക്തം<sup>36</sup> ചേർന്നുണ്ട്  
 ബലംപെരിയതമ്പി ബലഭീമൻ രാജാവല്ലോ,  
 കുളിച്ചുടുത്തൊരുങ്ങിവേകം  
 അന്നഭോജനങ്ങളു് ഉഴഞ്ഞായി  
 ആദ്യംപിടിച്ച അന്നത്തിന്  
 കരിക്കട്ടയുമോതട്ടി കിട്ടിയോവേഗം,  
 ആ പാകങ്ങളു് അങ്ങു മാറിവെക്കാം;  
 വേറൊരുപാകത്തിൽ ഉഴഞ്ഞായി  
 രണ്ടാമതുപിടിച്ചൊരു അന്നത്തിലു്  
 'വെള്ളാരംപാറ എനിക്കകിട്ടി എന്ന്'  
 തന്നെസ്സാലെ ഒന്നു നിരൂപിച്ചല്ലോ  
 കൈമുടക്കിയോ വാങ്ങി എഴിച്ചുടനെ  
 വെള്ളികിണ്ടിയിൽ നിറനീരെടുത്തു്  
 കയ്യും വായുമവൻ ചുത്തിവരുത്തി  
 നാടകം കൂത്തിനു മെല്ലവെ ചമഞ്ഞതുപോലെ  
 ബലംപെരിയതമ്പി ബലഭീമനും  
 ഇന്നും കേൾക്കയോ എന്റെ പാഞ്ചാലിയൊ,  
 പാർ<sup>37</sup>വഞ്ചിയിലൊന്നു ഒരുക്കവേഗം  
 അമ്മൊഴികേട്ടതോരു പാഞ്ചാലിയെ  
 പാർവഞ്ചിയിലു മിന്നൊരുക്കുന്നുവല്ലോ

36. ആവൃത്തി.

37. പാർവഞ്ചി=വലിയ ഭാരംകൊണ്ടുപോകുന്ന വഞ്ചി. പാഞ്ചാലന്മാർ  
 വഞ്ചി എവിടെനിന്നു കിട്ടിയെന്നു് ചോദിച്ചാൽ അവരെ കേരളീയരാക്കിയിരിക്കയാ  
 ളെന്നു സമധാനവുമുണ്ടു്.



മെത്തപായുമോ<sup>38</sup> ഒന്നു തട്ടിവിരിച്ചു്  
 കാക്കലല്ലോ വെള്ളിതലയണ വെയ്ക്കാൻ,  
 തലയ്ക്കുലല്ലോ പൊന്നുതലയണ വെയ്ക്കാൻ,  
 കാക്കലല്ലോ വിളക്കുവെയ്ക്കുന്നിതാ.  
 അഞ്ചഞ്ചതല്ലോ തിരിയുമിട്ടു്  
 അകുനിയാലെ അവൾ തിരികൊള്ളത്തി.  
 അഴകിനാലെ തിരി ചൂണ്ടിനില്പാൻ  
 മരപ്പാവകളെക്കൂടി ഒരുക്കിയിട്ടുണ്ടു്  
 പുഷ്പങ്ങളുമോ വാരിവിരിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടു്.  
 ബലംപെരിയ തമ്പിബലഭീമനും  
 ചെന്നടനെ ഇന്നു നോക്കിയുകൊണ്ടു്  
 പുഞ്ചിരിയിട്ടു മന്നൻ ചിരിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു്  
 പണ്ടാരപള്ളി<sup>39</sup> എന്ന അറതുറന്നു്  
 അറയ്ക്കുകത്തുമോ കരയേറിചെന്ന്  
 ചെമ്പുപാവട്ടി മെല്ലെ എടുത്തുകൊണ്ടു്  
 കാരോറുമോ നല്ല കളിതിണ്ണക്കു്<sup>40</sup>  
 കൊണ്ടുടനെ വെച്ചുകൊണ്ടു്  
 വായ്ക്കെടുമോ മെല്ലെ അഴിക്കുന്നിതാ  
 വെളിക്കു വീരത്താനും ഇറങ്ങിയിട്ടില്ലാ  
 വാലുതുക്കി വെളിക്കുവിട്ടു്  
 എന്നിററുമോ അവൻ ഉത്ത<sup>41</sup> പോയല്ലോ  
 വെശം<sup>42</sup> തരുവാൻ വന്നകള്ളൻനീയെ,  
 വെശംതന്നിച്ചുതന്നെ പോകണംനീയെ,  
 ആമൊഴിയോ ഒന്നു കേട്ടുകൊണ്ടു്  
 അഞ്ചുതല അഞ്ചുപത്തി ഒരുക്കി

38. കരുതരം പായ. ഇതു് തിരുവിതാംകൂറിൽ (കായംകുളം) ഉണ്ടാക്കുന്നതാണു്.

39. പണ്ടരും പള്ളിയറ=പണ്ടാരവും പള്ളിയറയും രാജതപം സൂചിപ്പിക്കുന്ന വാക്കുകളാണു്. പള്ളിയിടത്തെ ശ്രേഷ്ഠവാചിയാണല്ലോ.

40. “കാരാടം തിണ്ണ” വടക്കൻപാട്ടിൽ ധാരാളം കാണുന്നതാണു്.

41. നേരെനിന്നു എന്നർത്ഥം.

42. വിഷം.

കാലിന്റെ ഒരു വെള്ളനോക്കി  
 ഒരുകൊത്തു 'കുള' കൊത്തിയപ്പോഴു്  
 പാരാമലയിന്നു ഇടിഞ്ഞതുപോലെ  
 ഭീമസേനനുമിന്നു പാടുകൊടുത്തു<sup>43</sup>  
 നകലൻ ചകരേവനാരു ഇരുപേരും  
 അമ്മ മാതാവും അമ്മൂന്നനായി  
 മുറവിളി ഭൂഖണ്ഡമുളകൊളുന്നല്ലോ.  
 ഇവരുനാലുപേരും കൂടവെചെന്നു്  
 ഭീമസേനനെ ഇന്നങ്ങു് എടുത്തിടുമോ  
 തറവിട്ടുമാ മന്നൻ കിളയ<sup>44</sup>ന്നില്ലാ  
 പാഞ്ചാലിയുമിന്നു മാതാവുമായി  
 ചെന്നുടനെ ഒന്നങ്ങു് എടുത്തപ്പോഴു്  
 പാറകരിയില<sup>45</sup> ഉയന്നുതുപോലെ  
 പതയ്തുപോലെ കിളയന്നിതാ  
 പാരവഞ്ചിയിൽകൊണ്ടു കിടത്തിവേഗം  
 മുറപോലെയുള്ള കർമ്മങ്ങളും  
 അവിടെവെച്ചുതന്നെ നടത്തിവേഗം  
 നെടുമുടലുമൊന്നുമേ മുടിവേഗം  
 പൊന്നുത്ത(ന)രുകോല ഏഴുതുന്നിതാ  
 ഏതുരാജ്യത്തെങ്കിലുംചെന്നു തടഞ്ഞു  
 ആരെങ്കിലുംകണ്ടു വഞ്ചിയേലെന്നു്  
 പിടിച്ചുടനെ ഇന്നു് അടി(ടു)പ്പിച്ചല്ലോ  
 തുറന്നുടനെ ഇന്നു വിശം ഇറക്കി  
 വിശമിറക്കി ഇന്നങ്ങു എടുക്കുംപേക്കു  
 എന്നും നേടിയിടും പിള്ളയുതന്നെ !  
 അരിയോരുകലത്തിലേക്കുടയവൻതന്നെ !

43. വീഴുക, ആ ചാരഭാഷയിൽ 'പാടുകൽ' ആവുക എന്നുപറഞ്ഞാൽ മരിക്ക എന്നർത്ഥമാണ്.

44. കിളയകം=പൊങ്ങുക—ഇളകുക. ഇളകി (ആവേശത്തോടെ) പുറപ്പെടുക എന്നും അർത്ഥമുണ്ട്. 'കടികിളയക' എന്നുപറഞ്ഞാൽ ഒരിക്കലുമെന്നായി ഇളകി പുറപ്പെടുക. 'ഒരിക്കക'—മാരണപ്രയോഗംകൊണ്ടു കൊല്ലുക.

45. പാറന്ന കരിയില.

കരുക്ഷത്തിലേക്കു ഉറവൻതന്നെ !  
 ബലംപെരിയതമ്പി ബലഭീമനും  
 ഇവൻതന്നെയെന്നു കരുതിക്കൊള്ളുവിൻ !  
 പൊന്നംഞ്ഞ(ന)റുക്കോല ഏഴുതിയോവേകം  
 തിരുമുടിയിലാക കെട്ടുമല്ലോ.  
 പാരവഞ്ചിലിനെ അടച്ചുപൂട്ടി  
 വന്നു പൂട്ടുകുളിരച്ചു  
 നാക(ഗ)പുരത്തു നാക(ഗ)<sup>46</sup>കടലിൽ  
 പാരവഞ്ചയലി(തി)നെ കൊണ്ടുചെന്നല്ലോ.  
 സമുദ്ര(ഭ)ത്തിലോകൂടെ ഒഴുകുന്നിതാ  
 അസ്രംവലിച്ചിന്നു വിട്ടതുപോലെ  
 പാരവഞ്ചിയിലുണ്ട് ഒഴുകുന്നല്ലോ.  
 കരുനാട്ടിലും അമ്മ കാന്താരിയെ  
 പാവട്ടികൊടുത്തയച്ചു നാളതുതൊട്ട്  
 ഉറങ്ങു മുറക്കുവു മവക്കില്ലെന്ന്  
 ഏഴിന്റെ അന്നു പുലർകാലമേ  
 നാക(ഗ)പുരത്തുള്ള കടലിൽകൂടെ  
 പാരാവഞ്ചിയേലു അങ്ങ് ഒഴുകുന്നത്  
 കാന്തകാരി ഇന്നു കണ്ടതുംകൊണ്ട്  
 നൂററുപേരെകൂടെ വിളിക്കുന്നല്ലോ  
 ഇന്നും കേൾപ്പിനെന്റെ നൂറുപേരെ !  
 വള്ളങ്ങളും ചെറുതോണികളെല്ലാം  
 വലിച്ചിറക്കി നിങ്ങൾ കടലിൽ ഇറങ്ങി  
 പാരവഞ്ചലിനെ പിടിച്ചു നിങ്ങൾ  
 കരയ്ക്കടനെ നിങ്ങൾ കൊണ്ടുണ്ടുപിടിച്ചുടനെ  
 പള്ളികടകൂട്ടി എരിക്കണം നിങ്ങൾ  
 അമ്മൊഴികേട്ടതോരു നൂററുപേരെല്ലാം  
 വള്ളങ്ങളും ചെറുതോണികളെല്ലാം  
 വലിച്ചിറക്കിയവരു കടലിൽ ഇറങ്ങി

46. വടക്കൻപാട്ടിലും ഒരു നാഗപുരമുണ്ട്. അത് നാഗപുരത്തിന്റെ മറ്റൊരു രൂപമായിട്ടാണ് കാണുന്നത്. ഇവിടെ പാതാളമാണെന്നു പറയാം.

പാരവഞ്ചലിനെ ചെറുത്തുവിടിച്ച്  
 കരയ്ക്കുകൊണ്ടു അടുപ്പിച്ച്  
 മായാമുകന്ദനെ അച്ചനാരുടെ ഉതവിയായലെ  
 കുറക്കാത്തത്തലത്തു<sup>47</sup> മഴകുറത്തു  
 വെട്ടാത്തത്തലത്തു വെള്ളിടിവെട്ടി  
 പേനാപെരുവെള്ളം<sup>48</sup> പെയ്യിറങ്ങി  
 കരയ്ക്കുടത്ത വഞ്ചിയലിനെ  
 തിരിയെ സമുത്തിരത്തിൽ കൊണ്ടിറക്കി  
 നൂറുപേരു ഒട്ടുപേരു ചത്തുനീക്കുന്നു  
 ഒട്ടുപേരു കരയ്ക്കും കയറി  
 നാക(ഗ)പുരത്തു വഞ്ചിയൻ ഒഴുകുന്നു.

47. സ്ഥലം.

48. പെരുവെള്ളത്തിന്റെ പേന (പേപ്പടി) യ്ക്കു ഉപമിക്കുന്നതിൽ രസികത്വമുണ്ട്. പേ നായ ഇന്നലിക്കിലേക്കാണ് പോകയെന്നുള്ളതു് നിശ്ചയിച്ചുകടല്ലോ. അങ്ങിനെ അന്തഃവിട്ടു വരുന്ന വെള്ളമെന്നു താല്പര്യം.

## II

നാക(ഗ)പുരംവാഴ് നാക(ഗ)കന്നിക്ക്  
 മാലവിതിയു<sup>1</sup>മില്ല മതിയുമില്ലാ  
 മാലക്കൊരുവനെ കാണാഞ്ഞിട്ട്  
 ടുക്കം(ഖം)പൂണ്ടു കന്നി വൃസനം<sup>2</sup>പൂണ്ടു്  
 “എന്തരത്തിലൊത്തൊരു തോഴിമാരല്ലോ  
 ഒരുക്കണവൻപോർ ഉണ്ടവർ ഒന്ന്  
 ഒരുക്കണവൻമുണ്ടു് ഉടുപ്പവരുണ്ടു്  
 ഓരോവിലക്കം പൊച്ചിരിപ്പവരുണ്ടു്  
 ഒരുപാലകനെ പെററവരുണ്ടു്  
 ഒരുപാലകൻകളി കണ്ടവരുണ്ടു്  
 മൂപ്പത്തിമൂന്നു നല്ല തിരുവയസ്സ്  
 മാലക്കൊരുവനെ കണ്ടതുമില്ല  
 മാലവിതികെട്ട പാപിയോ ഞാൻ.”  
 ടുക്കം(ഖം)പൂണ്ടു കന്നി വൃസനംപൂണ്ടു്  
 അങ്ങനെയോ കന്നി ഇരിക്കുമ്പോഴു്  
 വിട്ണ(ഷ്ണ) എന്ന ദൈവതിരുവടിയല്ലോ  
 മടവാതിവേശ<sup>3</sup>മാകപൂണ്ടതുംകൊണ്ടു്  
 അത്തലത്തുതന്നെ ചെന്നൊരുനേരം  
 ‘ഇന്നും കേളെന്റെ കന്നിയെ കണ്ടെന്ത !  
 അന്നദാനഭിക്ഷ<sup>4</sup> കൊടുക്കവേഗം  
 ഒരുവീട്ടിലോ ഇന്നു ഭിക്ഷയുമില്ലാ  
 പലവീട്ടിലൊ ഇന്നു ഭിക്ഷയുന്തന്നെ’  
 ഇന്നും കേളിപെററ മടവാതി കേളു്  
 എൻകയ്യിനാലോ ഭിക്ഷതന്നാലല്ലോ.  
 മറുവീട്ടിൽപോലും ഭിക്ഷ ലഭിക്കയില്ലാ  
 ഇത്രക്കു ഞാനോ അറുപാപിയും

---

1. മാലക്കുള്ള വിധി (കല്യാണത്തിന്നു്).

2. ആവൃത്തി.

3. മടവാത്തി-തം-അന്യായക്കുരി, സങ്കടക്കുരി-പ്രകൃതത്തിൽ പിമുക്കുരി.

4. സാധാരണ നാടോടിപ്പാട്ടിൽ കാണാറുള്ള ആവൃത്തി ഇതിലും കാണുന്നു-  
 അന്നദാനഭിക്ഷ.

'ഇന്നു കേളെ ഏന്റെ കന്നികെ കണ്ടെ !  
 ഇടതു കരം ഒരു നീട്ടുകവേഗം  
 കൈകളെ കുറിവരമാർഗ്ഗം പറയും ഞാൻ'.  
 കൈകളെ കുറിവരമാർഗ്ഗം പറഞ്ഞുകൊണ്ട്  
 അല്ലി മുല്ല രണ്ടുവിത്തു കൊടുത്തു,  
 അല്ലികുപ്പുറം പുഞ്ചനിലത്തിൽ  
 പുഞ്ചനിലത്തിലൊ പുതുമണ്ണിച്ച്  
 മുല്ലത്തടം ഒരു കുറയുന്തീർത്തു  
 മുല്ലനട്ടു നീയ് നീരതുകോരി  
 മുല്ല പൂത്തുടനെ പൂ ചൊരിയുമ്പോൾ  
 മാലവിതിയന്നു ലഭിക്കുമെന്ന്  
 മടവാതിയാളുതന്നെ പറഞ്ഞുകൊണ്ട്  
 അപ്പോഴായതോരു കന്നിയേ കണ്ടത്  
 'ഇന്നും കേൾപ്പിനെന്റെ തോഴിമാരെ !  
 മടവാതിപണ്ടാരത്തിനു ഭിക്ഷുകൊടുപ്പിൻ !'  
 തോഴിമാരുമാ ഭിക്ഷ കൊണ്ടുചെന്നപ്പോൾ  
 'ഇന്നും കേൾക്കയോ ഏന്റെ തോഴിമാരെ !  
 നിങ്കളിനാലെ ഭിക്ഷ വാങ്ങുകയില്ല  
 കണ്ടുകയ്യിനാലെ ഭിക്ഷയുവാങ്ങൂ'  
 അന്തിനേരമൊടു അഴകൊടു കന്നിയെ, കണ്ടെ !  
 ഭിക്ഷയുകൊണ്ടു ചെന്നപ്പോൾ  
 മടവാതിയെ എങ്ങും കാണാനില്ല.  
 മായമായിവന്നതൊരു മടവാതിതന്നെ  
 തൻ മനസ്സുകൊണ്ടു നിരൂപിച്ചല്ലോ  
 പിറന്നൊളമോ നല്ല പുലർകാലമെ  
 തോഴിമാരെയുമല്ലൊ വിളിച്ചുകൊണ്ട്  
 അല്ലികുപ്പുറത്തു പുഞ്ചനിലത്തിൽ  
 പുഞ്ചനിലത്തിലൊ പുതുമണ്ണിലെ  
 മുല്ലത്തടമെന്നു കുറയുന്തീർത്തു  
 വലതുകയ്യിനാലെ മുല്ലയുറപ്പ്  
 ഇടതുകയ്യിനാലെ മണ്ണു മണച്ചു

വെള്ളിക്കിണ്ടിനിയെ നീരുകൊണ്ടുൻ  
 നല്ല തിപ്പു<sup>6</sup>മോചൊല്ലി നീരൊഴിച്ചു്  
 ഇന്നുംകേൾക്കയോ എന്റെ അല്ലിമുല്ലേ!<sup>7</sup>  
 ഞാനുംപെണ്ണുമോ, നീയുംപെണ്ണുതന്നല്ലോ,  
 നിൻകുമാരിയുമിന്നു് അഴിയുംകാലം  
 എൻകുമാരിയുമിന്നു അഴിയുംകാലം  
 നല്ല തിപ്പുമോചൊല്ലി നീരുംകോരി  
 അന്നങ്ങവരുടെ വീടുപുക്കു  
 പിറന്നാളുമോ നല്ല പുലർകാലമെ  
 നീരുകോരിയോ അവർ വീട്ടിലുംപോയി  
 മുല്ലനട്ടത്തൊരു മൂന്നാംനാളിൽ  
 വെള്ളിമണിപ്പാള കയരെടുത്തു  
 ചെമ്പുപുതുകുടം തന്നിലെടുത്തു്  
 തോഴിമാരെയല്ലോ വിളിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു്  
 ഉരുത്തെന അവർ നോക്കിനടന്നു്  
 ഉരുത്തെന അവർ കണ്ടതുംകെണ്ടു്  
 വെള്ളിമണിപ്പാള കയറുത്തു  
 ചെമ്പും പുതുകുടം കോരിനിറച്ചു്  
 പിന്നും ഒരുപാളവെള്ളവും കോരി  
 കണ്ണും മുകുടവും ശുദ്ധിവരുത്തി  
 വെള്ളിമണിപ്പാള കയരെടുത്തു്  
 ചെമ്പും പുതുകുടം എടുത്തുകൊണ്ടു്  
 ഒട്ടു പകുതിദൂരം കൊണ്ടുചെന്നപ്പോൾ  
 വണ്ടനാ<sup>8</sup>രുമൊ ഒന്നു വരവതുകണ്ടു്  
 “ഇന്നുംകേൾക്ക എന്റെ വണ്ടനാരെ !  
 എവിടെനിന്നുമൊ താനും വരുന്നതിപ്പോൾ”  
 ‘അല്ലികടപ്പുറം പുഞ്ചനിലത്തിൽ  
 പുഞ്ചനിലത്തിലൊ പുതുമണ്ണിലു്  
 മുല്ലവളമുണ്ടു വരുന്നതു ഞാൻ.’

6. നന്മ, തിന്മ.

7. മുല്ലയെ ശ്രീയാക്കികല്പിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു.

8. വണ്ട—വണ്ടത്താൻ, വണ്ടനാർ.

അമ്മൊഴികേട്ടതോരു കന്നിക കുഞ്ഞെ!  
 ചെമ്പുകടത്തിനെ ഭൂരെ എറിഞ്ഞു്  
 മുല്ലതടത്തിലോടിചെന്നപ്പോഴു്  
 മുല്ലപൂത്തു അങ്ങ പൂ ചൊരിഞ്ഞു  
 കിടക്കുന്നതൊരുനില കണ്ടുകൊണ്ടു്  
 മോകാലസ്യമോവന്നു വീണുപോയി  
 അരുകിൽ നിന്നതോരു തോഴിമാരെ  
 കൈക്കുവിടിച്ചല്ലേ മെയിലണച്ചു  
 വെള്ളം കുടിദാഹം തീർത്തുകൊണ്ടു്  
 എഴീരെഴീരു!<sup>9</sup> കന്നി മടികൂടാതെ  
 ഏഴാംനിലനല്ല മാളികേലിന്റെ  
 മുകളിൽ കൊണ്ടുചെന്നു സുകമിരുത്തി  
 “ഇന്നും കേളായോ, എന്റെ തോഴിമാരെ!  
 എട്ടുകെട്ടി<sup>10</sup>മൊ നല്ല ഇടക്കെട്ടിനകത്തു്  
 പൊന്നുംമണിക്കൂട്ടു കിളിക്കൂട്ടുമോ  
 അവിടെത്തന്നെയങ്ങു ഇരിപ്പതുണ്ടു്.  
 വേകം വിരവാലെ കൊണ്ടുവരണം.  
 പാലൊട്ടു പഴങ്ങളും കൊണ്ടുവരണം.  
 അമ്മൊഴികേട്ടതൊരു തോഴിമാരു്  
 മണിക്കൂട്ടും കിളിക്കൂട്ടും കൊണ്ടുവന്നല്ലോ  
 പാലൊട്ടുപഴങ്ങളും കൊണ്ടുവന്നല്ലോ  
 നീലവരിവണ്ടും കുമാരിവണ്ടു്  
 വാണാലുണ്ണി ചെല്ലക്കിളിമകളെ!  
 തുറന്നടനെ ഇന്നു വെളിക്കുവിട്ടു്  
 പാലൊട്ടു പഴങ്ങളുമുതുകൊടുത്തു  
 ഇന്നും കേൾക്കയോ എന്റെ കിളിമകളെ!  
 എവിടെയെങ്കിലുംചെന്നു പിഴച്ചുകൊള്ളിൻ!  
 വളർത്തിയ കച്ചിനാലെ തട്ടിപ്പറത്തി<sup>11</sup>

9. ഏഴുനീരറിടി!

10. കേരളത്തിലെ ഗൃഹനിഷ്ഠാണരീതി നാഗലോകത്തും കവി എത്തിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു.

11. പരപ്പിച്ചു.



അവിടെനിന്നുമോ ചുറ്റിലാവിപറന്നു  
 തെക്കേനില്ക്കും നല്ല തേൻപുളിമുകളിൽ  
 ചെന്നടനെ ഇന്നു പറന്നുപററി  
 അവിടെ ഇരുന്നു ഇന്നും പറയുന്നിതാ  
 “ഇന്നും കേൾക്ക ഏന്റെ വണ്ടനാരെ!  
 കൂടുകൂടി നമുക്കു പഴക്കമില്ല  
 നഞ്ചും കനിതിന്നു പഴക്കമില്ല  
 പച്ചപ്പുളിതിന്നു വഴക്കമില്ല  
 പച്ചക്കുതിർ മുറിഞ്ഞു തഴക്കമില്ല,  
 പച്ചതിന മുറിഞ്ഞു തഴക്കമില്ല  
 ഏലാവാരം<sup>12</sup> നാമും പോയാലു്  
 ഏലാപിള്ളകൾ<sup>13</sup> കണ്ണിയും<sup>14</sup> വയ്ക്കും.  
 കടലുവാരമൊ നാമും പോയാലു്  
 മലയിൽ കുറവർ കണ്ണിയും വയ്ക്കും.  
 കടലുവാരം നാമും പോയാലു്  
 കടലിൽവീണു നാമും മരിച്ചുപോകും.  
 ഏതുവഴിക്കിനി പോകിലാമെന്ന്  
 സമുത്തിരം(ഭ്രം)വഴിതന്നെ പോകിലാം എന്ന്”  
 തന്നെസ്സാലെ നിരൂപിച്ചല്ലോ  
 അവിടെനിന്നുമോ ചുറ്റിലാവിപറന്ന്  
 സമുത്തിരം(ഭ്രം)വഴിതന്നെ പറക്കുമ്പോഴു്  
 പപ്പം<sup>15</sup> ചിറകുകൾ തളൻപോയി  
 സമുത്തിരം(ഭ്രം)ത്തിലുമോ വീണുമരിക്കുമെന്ന്  
 തന്നെസ്സാലെ ഒന്നു നിരൂപിച്ചപ്പോൾ  
 മായമായിട്ടൊരു താമരഇലയും പൂവും  
 അവിടെതോന്നിയോവേഗം  
 താമരഇലയിലങ്ങിരുന്നുകൊണ്ടു്

12. ഏലംവളരുന്ന സ്ഥലം.

13. അതിന്റെ ഉടമസ്ഥനായവർ. ‘പിള്ള’ ഇവിടെ സ്ഥാനപ്പേരായി ഉണ്ടു് കരുതേണ്ടതു്.

14. പുതിയതായി ഉണ്ടാവുന്ന ഇല. അതിൽ ഒരു കെട്ടിന്നും ഇതുതന്നെയാണു് പറയുന്നതു്.

15. തൂവൽ.

# 'SOME STAGES OF LOVE IN THE VIEWS OF ĀLANKĀRIKĀS

By

P. KRISHNAN NAIR,

*Junior Lecturer in Malayalam.*

In this article the author discusses the ten aspects of Sṅgāra—

Such as, Desire, Anxiety, Recollection, Praise, Mental agitation, Lamentation, Madness, Sickness, Inaction, Death.



ആലങ്കാരികന്മാർ നിദ്ദേശിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന  
കാമാവസ്ഥകൾ .

SOME STAGES OF LOVE IN THE  
VIEWS OF ALANKARIKAS

By

P. KRISHNAN NAIR,  
*Junior Lecturer in Malayalam.*

ശ്രംഗാരമെന്നു പറയപ്പെടുന്ന രസം സാമാന്യമായി സംഭോഗമെന്നും, വിപ്രലംഭമെന്നും രണ്ടുവിധമാകുന്നുവെന്നാണ് ആലങ്കാരികസിദ്ധാന്തം. പക്ഷേ,

“അയോഗോ വിപ്രയോഗശ്ച സംഭോഗശ്ചേതി സ ത്രിധാ.”

എന്നിങ്ങിനെ അയോഗം, വിപ്രയോഗം, സംഭോഗം എന്നു മൂന്നുതരത്തിലാണ് ശ്രംഗാരമെന്നു ദശരൂപകകാരൻ പറഞ്ഞു കാണുന്നുണ്ടെങ്കിലും അയോഗവും വിപ്രയോഗവും വിപ്രലംഭത്തിന്റെ വകഭേദങ്ങൾ മാത്രമാകയാൽ അതിനെ കാര്യമാക്കേണ്ടതില്ലെന്നാണ് തോന്നുന്നത്. സാമാന്യവിഭാഗത്തിൽ അവാന്തരവിഭാഗത്തെക്കൂടി ഉൾപ്പെടുത്തുക യുക്തമല്ലല്ലോ. അങ്ങിനെയാണെങ്കിൽ മാനശാപപ്രവാസകരുണപ്രകാശങ്ങളെപ്പോലും ഗണിക്കേണ്ടതായി വരികയില്ലേ? പരസ്സരാവലോകനാലിംഗനചുംബനാദികളായ സംഭോഗപ്രകാരങ്ങൾ അസംഖ്യയങ്ങളും അപരിച്ഛേദ്യങ്ങളുമാകയാൽ സംഭോഗത്തെ മമ്മടഭട്ടാചികൾ ഒന്നായിട്ടേ ഗണിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളൂ. എന്നാൽ, ഭോജൻ, ശാരദാന്തയൻ, ശിംഗിഭൂപൻ മുതലായവർ വിപ്രലംഭപ്രകാരങ്ങളുടെ ആനന്തര്യംകൊണ്ടുണ്ടാകാവുന്ന വൈശിഷ്ട്യത്തെ ആധാരമാക്കി സംക്ഷിപ്തം, സങ്കീർണ്ണം, സമ്പൂർണ്ണം, സമൃദ്ധം എന്നിങ്ങിനെ സംഭോഗത്തെ നാലുവിധത്തിൽ വിഭാഗിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു. ഇവരുടെ പക്ഷത്തിൽ വിപ്രലംഭവും, പൂർ്വ്വാനുരാഗം, മാനം, പ്രവാസം, കരുണം എന്നു നാലുവിധത്തിലാണ്. ശാപ

വിപ്രലംഭം പ്രവാസപ്രകാരത്താൽ ചരിതാർത്ഥമാകുമെന്നാണ് ഇവരുടെ അഭിപ്രായം. ഭിന്നഭേദസ്ഥിതിയോടുകൂടിയ ശാപവിപ്രലംഭം പ്രവാസത്തിൽ പെടുത്താമെങ്കിലും പാണ്ഡുവിനും അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ ഭാര്യമാർക്കും അനുഭവിക്കേണ്ടി വന്ന ഏകസ്ഥലസ്ഥിതിയോടുകൂടിയ ശാപവിപ്രലംഭം പ്രവാസത്തിൽപ്പെടുത്താൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ലാത്തതുകൊണ്ട് ശാപത്തെ പ്രത്യേകം ഗണിക്കുകയോ അല്ലെങ്കിൽ അയോഗം അതായത്, പൂർവ്വിപ്രലംഭം, മാനം, കരുണം, വിരഹം എന്നിങ്ങനെ നാലായി വിഭാഗിച്ചു്, ശാപം, പ്രവാസം എന്നിവയെ വിരഹപ്രകാരമായി ഗണിക്കുകയോ ചെയ്യുകയാണ് യുക്തമെന്നു തോന്നുന്നു. ഏതായാലും വിപ്രലംഭത്തിന്നു വിരഹമെന്നൊരു വകഭേദം അംഗീകരിക്കാതെ നിവൃത്തിയില്ല. സംഗമാനന്തരം വ്രതം, ഗുരുജനസാന്നിദ്ധ്യം, ആത്മവം മുതലായവയാൽ ഉണ്ടാകുന്ന വിപ്രലംഭവിശേഷം അയോഗത്തിലോ, ശാപത്തിലോ, പ്രവാസത്തിലോ, കരുണയിലോ ഉൾപ്പെടുകയില്ലല്ലോ. കാവ്യപ്രകാശകാരന്റെ പക്ഷത്തിൽ, അയോഗം, വിരഹം, മാനം, പ്രവാസം, ശാപം എന്ന് അഞ്ചു വിധമാണ് വിപ്രലംഭം. കരുണവിപ്രലംഭത്തെ അദ്ദേഹം പ്രവാസത്തിലാണുൾപ്പെടുത്തിയിരിക്കുന്നത്. ൨൩ മപ്രകൃതമല്ലായ്മയാൽ ഈ സംഗതിയെപ്പറ്റി ഇവിടെ ഇതിലധികമൊന്നും പറയുന്നില്ല.

കാമനീകാമുകന്മാരുടെ സമാഗമത്തിന്നു മുമ്പുള്ള ഉദ്രിക്തരതി-- ഉൽകടാനുരാഗം തന്നെയാകുന്നു അയോഗവിപ്രലംഭശൃംഗാരം. ശൃംഗാരമെന്നത് അജ്ഞാനാവരണം നീങ്ങിയ—പ്രകാശമാനമായ—രത്നവൽക്കിനമായ ചൈതന്യമാണെന്നും, ചൈതന്യവിശിഷ്ടമായ രതിയാണെന്നുമുള്ള ആലങ്കാരികമതഭേദമനുസരിച്ചു് ‘ഉദ്രിക്തരതി’പദത്തിൽ യഥായോഗം ബഹുവ്രീഹിസമാസവും കർമ്മധാരയസമാസവും കണ്ടുകൊൾക. അയോഗവിപ്രലംഭത്തിൽ ക്രമത്തിൽ 10 കാമാവസ്ഥകൾ വരാമെന്ന് ആലങ്കാരികന്മാർ അഭിപ്രായപ്പെടുന്നു. ഈ അവസ്ഥകൾ ഏതാണ്ടൊക്കെ മറ്റു വിപ്രലംഭപ്രഭേദങ്ങളിലും സംഭവിക്കുന്നതാണെങ്കിലും താരതമ്യേന രാഗാധിക്യത്തിന്ന് അവകാശമുള്ള അയോഗവിപ്രലംഭത്തിൽ എല്ലാം അവശ്യസംഭവിക്കു് മനോഹരതരങ്ങളുമാണെന്നു വിചാരത്താലായിരിക്കുമോ ആവോ ആലങ്കാരികന്മാർ പലരും അതിൽ മാത്രമായി നിർദ്ദേശിച്ചു കടന്നുപോയിരിക്കുന്നത്!

പുറമെ,

“ഏവം വിധൈഃ കാമലിംഗൈ രപ്രാപ്തസുരതോത്സവാ  
ഭഗാവസ്ഥാഗതം കാമം അനുഭാവൈഃ പ്രകാശയേൽ ”

(നാട്ടശാസ്ത്രം, അദ്ധ്യായം 24, ശ്ലോ. 159.)

എന്ന മഹദ്വിവചനം അവർക്ക് അതിലേക്ക് ഉപോദ്ബലകമായിരിക്കാമെന്നും നമുക്കു വിചാരിക്കാവുന്നതാണ്.

എന്നാൽ, മഹദ്വിയുടെ കാലടിപ്പാട്ടു കഴിയുന്നതും പിന്നുടരുന്ന പൗരസ്ത്യാലങ്കാരികന്മാർ ‘അപ്രാപ്തസുരതോത്സവാ’ എന്ന നാട്ടശാസ്ത്രപ്രയോഗമനുസരിച്ച് ഈ അവസ്ഥകൾ കേവലം സ്രീകൾക്കുള്ളതായി നിർദ്ദേശിക്കാഞ്ഞതു യുക്തമാണോ എന്നു സംശയിക്കേണ്ട. ലീലാവിലാസാദികളായ സാത്തപികാലങ്കാരങ്ങളെപ്പോലെ കാമാവസ്ഥകൾ സ്രീകൾക്കു മാത്രമേ സംഭവിക്കൂ എന്നോ, സ്രീകളുടെ തിൻമാത്രമേ മനോഹാരിതപമുള്ളവെന്നോ ഇല്ലല്ലോ. അതിന്നും പുറമെ, “സ്രീപുംസയോ രേഷവിധിഃ” എന്നു മഹദ്വി വ്യക്തമായി പിന്നീട് പ്രസ്താവിക്കുന്നുണ്ടുതാനും. പക്ഷേ, വിദ്യാനാഥൻ മുതലായ സ്വല്പം ചിലർ കാമാവസ്ഥകളെ ശൃംഗാരസാമാന്യമായി നിദ്ദേശിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നും ഈ അവസരത്തിൽ പറഞ്ഞുകൊള്ളുന്നു.

“പ്രഥമേതപദിലാഷസ്ത്യാൽ ദ്വിതീയേ ചിന്തനം ഭവേൽ  
അനുസ്മൃതി സ്തതീയേതു ചതുർത്ഥേ ഗുണകീർത്തനം  
ഉദ്ദേശഃ പഞ്ചമേ പ്രോക്തോ വിലാപഃ ഷഷ്ഠി ഉച്യതേ  
ഉന്മാദ സ്തപ്തമേ ജ്ഞേയോ ഭവേദ്വ്യാധി സ്തഥാഷ്ടമേ  
നവമേ ജഡതാ പ്രോക്താ ദശമേ മരണം ഭവേൽ  
സ്രീ പുംസയോരേഷവിധിഃ—”

(നാട്ടശാസ്ത്രം, അദ്ധ്യായം 24, ശ്ലോ. 260-62.)

അഭിലാഷം, ചിന്ത, അനുസ്മൃതി, ഗുണകീർത്തനം, ഉദ്ദേശം, വിലാപം, ഉന്മാദം, വ്യാധി, ജാഡ്യം, മരണം എന്നീ പത്തെണ്ണമാണ് ഭരതമഹദ്വി നിർദ്ദേശിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന കാമാവസ്ഥകൾ. അഭിലാഷമെന്നതു തനിക്കു അധീനമാകണമെന്നുള്ള തീവ്രേച്ഛാരൂപമായ ചിത്തവൃത്തിതന്നെ. വേഷഭൂഷാദികളണിഞ്ഞു് അനുരക്തജനത്തിന്റെ ദൃഷ്ടിക്കു വിഷയമാകുമാറു പ്രവർത്തിക്കുക, വിജനസ്ഥിതി, വ്യാജോക്തി, രാഗപ്രകാശന

പരങ്ങളായ ചേഷ്ഠാവിശേഷങ്ങൾ മുതലായവ അഭിലാഷകാര്യങ്ങളാകുന്നു. അനുരാഗചേഷ്ടകളുടെ സ്വരൂപവും സ്വഭാവവും വാത്സ്യായനത്തിലെ കന്യാസംപ്രയുക്താധികരണത്തിലുള്ള ഇംഗിതാകാരസൂചന പ്രകരണത്തിൽനിന്നു മനസ്സിലാക്കിക്കൊൾക. അഥവാ, സാഹിത്യ ഭഗ്ഗണത്തിൽ നിർദ്ദേശിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു,—

“നാണംകണ്ടങ്ങും കാണുമ്പോൾ നേരിട്ടങ്ങോട്ടു നോക്കിടാ  
പ്രിയൻ കടന്നുപോയിടി-ലൊളിവാതിട്ടു നോക്കിടും  
പലചോദ്യങ്ങൾ ചോദിച്ചാൽ മുഖം താഴ്ന്നിപ്പതുക്കവേ  
ഒച്ചയ്ക്കിടച്ചുയോടൊട്ടൊ-ട്ടായി പ്രിയനൊടോതിടും  
അന്യൻ തൽകഥ ചൊല്ലുമ്പോൾ അന്യരൂ മിഴിവെച്ചുതാൻ  
ശ്രദ്ധിച്ചതെല്ലാം കേട്ടീടും ബാലപ്പെണ്ണനുരാഗിണി  
പ്രിയനൊത്തൊപ്പൊഴും പാപ്പാൻ പ്രിയമേററുമാന്നിടും  
അവൻ കാണുന്നിടത്തെയും മോടികൂടാതെ ചെന്നിടാ  
തലകെട്ടൽ പുതപ്പെന്നു കളവാൽ കണ്മേദശവും  
മുഖയും നാഭിയും വ്യക്തമായ്തുറന്നങ്ങു കാട്ടിടും  
പ്രിയന്റെ പററിലുള്ളൊര-വാഗാഭ്യന്താൽ മയക്കിടും  
തന്മിത്രങ്ങളിൽ വിശ്വാസ ബഹുമാനങ്ങളാന്നിടും  
തദ്ഗുണം തോഴിമാരോടു ചൊല്ലും സ്വധനമേകിടും  
ഉറങ്ങിയേ താനറങ്ങു സുഖദുഃഖങ്ങൾ പങ്കിടും  
പ്രിയന്റെ ദൃഷ്ടിമാഗ്ഗ്ത്തിൽ നില്ക്കും ഭൂരത്തിലെപ്പൊഴും  
തോഴിമാരുടെ മുമ്പാകെ കാമബാധയുരച്ചിടും  
വല്ലവസ്തുക്കളും കണ്ടാൽ വെറുത്തേ താൻ ചിരിച്ചിടും  
ചൊറിയും ചെകിടവുണ്ണും അഴിക്കും തല കെട്ടിടും  
കോട്ടായിടും മൈത്തരികും പല്ലി ചുംബിക്കുമണ്ണിയെ  
തരമൊത്തൊരു തോഴിക്കു കത്തിക്കും പൊട്ടു നെററിയിൽ  
പാലാംതൃഷ്ണയാൽ വരയ്ക്കു മോട്ടക്കണ്ണിട്ടു നോക്കിടും  
കടിക്കുംമുണ്ടു കീഴ്പോട്ടുനോക്കി പ്രിയനൊടോതിടും  
എവിടെ പ്രിയനെക്കാണു മവിടം വിട്ടുപോയിടാ  
കാര്യത്തിനെന്നു കളവായ് തദ്ഗൃഹത്തിലണഞ്ഞിടും

കാന്തൻ കൊടുപ്പതും വാങ്ങി ധരിക്കും വേർത്തുനോക്കിടും  
തദ്യോഗത്തിൽ തെളിഞ്ഞീടും പിരിഞ്ഞാൽ മങ്ങിമാഴ്ന്നീടും  
തപ്പിലത്തെ പ്രശംസിക്കും തൽപ്രിയം പ്രിയമാക്കിടും  
നിസ്സാരവസ്തു യാചിക്കും ഉറക്കത്തിലനങ്ങിടാ  
സാത്തപികാഖ്യവികാരങ്ങൾ തേടുകില്ല തദന്തികേ  
സുന്ദരതം തോഴിയോടോതു മനുരാഗമെഴുവന്നാവം.

(ഭാഷാസാഹിത്യഭൂപ്പണം)

ഈ വകയിൽ പൂർവ്വാന്തരാഗത്തിൽ സംഭവിക്കാവുന്നവയെ ഗ്രഹിച്ചു കൊൾക. കൂടാതെ, മറെറാരാളുടെ വിവാഹാലോചനയിലും അതിന്നു അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നവരിലും വെറുപ്പു കാണിക്കുക, അന്തരംഗസഖികളല്ലാത്തവരുടെ അടുക്കൽ അന്തരക്കരുണത്തിന്റെ സൗന്ദര്യവീർവാദിഗുണങ്ങളെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു ബഹുമാനമില്ലാത്തമട്ടിൽ സംസാരിക്കുക, പ്രിയൻ കാണാമാറ് അറിയാത്ത ഭാവത്തിൽ സഖിയെ ആശ്ശോഷിക്കുക, താടിയുഴിയുക, പ്രിയന്റെ സാന്നിദ്ധ്യത്തിൽ കൺമഴുലുക, സ്നേഹം വിജ്ഞാപിക്കുക, മടിക്കത്തുഴിയുക, വസ്യത്തുവൃതിരിപ്പിടിക്കുക, വിറ, രോമാഞ്ചം, വിയർപ്പു മുതലായ സാത്തപികഭാവങ്ങൾ ഉണ്ടാവുക മുതലായവലതും യഥാസംഭവം ഉഴരിച്ചുകൊള്ളുക. “സാത്തപികാഖ്യവികാരങ്ങൾ തേടുകില്ല” എന്നതിലെ സാത്തപികവികാരശബ്ദംകൊണ്ട് ഉദ്ദേശിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നത് കഥാ തുല്യം, മൂക്കു കറക്കുക മുതലായവയല്ലാതെ സ്വേദരോമാഞ്ചാദികളല്ല. സത്തപം=ശരീരം. “ഭേദാത്മകം ഭവേൽ സത്തപം” എന്നു നാട്യശാസ്ത്രവിവരണം നോക്കുക.

(അദ്ധ്യായം 24, ശ്ലോകം 7.)

അന്തരാഗചേഷ്ടകളിൽ ഏതാനും ചിലതിന് ഉദാഹരണം,—

“ഓമൽക്കണ്ണു ചുഴുന്നിടുന്നു, നിടിലം വേർക്കുന്നു, രോമാഞ്ചമഷ്ടാമം നൽക്കവിളാന്നിടുന്നി, തയരേ ചേരുന്ന ഭന്താങ്കരം, കാമം കഞ്ചളി കീറുമാർന്നിജം പൊങ്ങുന്നു, നീങ്ങുന്നിതാ ശ്രീമന്നീവി, കഴങ്ങിടുന്നിതിവരം നിൻ രൂപാസവാസേവയാൽ.”

(പ്രണയവിലാസം)



“തങ്കക്കാപ്പണികൈകൾ പൊക്കി വിരൽ കോ-

ത്താലക്ഷ്യഭോമൂലകം

കൊങ്കക്കുന്നുകളൊന്നു വീത്തുയരമാ-

റല്ലം ഞളിഞ്ഞന്തരാ

മങ്കത്തച്ചിവരും മുരിന്തുന്നിടുവതിൽ

തപസ്സുലഭാം മാന്വഥാ-

തങ്കം കാണവതിന്നു കണ്ണിയലുവോ-

ക്കില്ലിങ്ങു തെല്ലും പണി.”

(പ്രണയവിലാസം)

“വെൺകൽത്തുണൊരുകയ്യുകൊണ്ടു മുറുകെ

കെട്ടിപ്പിടിച്ചുദ്രസാൽ

കൊങ്കത്തട്ടതിൽ വെച്ചുമത്തു കളിയാ-

യുരൂപഗ്രന്ഥം സഖേ,

മങ്കത്തച്ചിവിടേക്കിടയ്ക്കിടയില-

ക്കൺകോണെറിഞ്ഞന്യമാം

തങ്കക്കൈത്തലമാന്ന് താമര മുക്-

ന്നീടുനിതാ മോഹനം.”

(പ്രണയവിലാസം)

“കൂന്തൽക്കെട്ടു പിടിച്ചഴിച്ചു വെറുതേ

കെട്ടിടിനാരും വീണ്ടുമ-

ശ്രാന്തം സ്വാംഗുലിലീല കഞ്ചളിക തൻ

ബന്ധേ നടത്തിടിനാരും

സാന്തഃസ്തോഭമേണച്ചു കൊച്ചുശിശുവെ

ച്ചുംബിച്ചുകൊണ്ടാരും തുരു-

പാന്തത്തിങ്കലിവണ്ണ മത്തരണിയാരും

കാണിച്ചു കാമംഗിതം.”

(പ്രണയവിലാസം)

ഇങ്ങിനെ മറ്റുള്ളവയ്ക്കും ഉദാഹരിച്ചുകൊൾക.

ചിന്തനം=ചിന്ത. ‘സമാഗമോപായമെന്ത്? കായ്സിദ്ധി വരുമോ? എത്രകാലം കാത്തിരിക്കണം? ഭൂതിയെ പറഞ്ഞയക്കണമോ? എന്താണ് പറഞ്ഞയക്കേണ്ടത്? കത്തെഴുതിയാലോ? എങ്ങിനെയാണെഴുതേണ്ടത്’ ഇത്യാദിവിചാരമാണ് ചിന്തനം. വസ്തുതസ്വ

തിരിപ്പിടിക്കുക, വള മോതിരം മുതലായവ ഉഴരിയും ഇട്ടും കൊണ്ടിരിക്കുക, വെറുതേയിരിക്കുക, നിർദ്വേഷ്യമായി നോക്കുക, കിടക്കയിൽ തിരിഞ്ഞും മറിഞ്ഞും കിടക്കുക, കണ്ണീർ തുടുക, ഉറക്കം വരാതിരിക്കുക മുതലായവ ചിന്താകാർഷ്ട്യങ്ങൾ.

ഉദാഹരണം,—

പ്രിയംവദ—ആ രാജാവിൻ ഇവളെ സ്നേഹഭാവത്തോടെ നോക്കിക്കൊണ്ട് അഭിലാഷം സൂചിപ്പിക്കുന്നുണ്ട്. ഈയിടെ അദ്ദേഹത്തിന് ഉറക്കച്ചുടവു കാണുന്നുണ്ട്.

രാജാവ്:—ശരി; ഏന്റെ അവസ്ഥ ഇങ്ങിനെതന്നെ ആയിത്തീർന്നിരിക്കുന്നു,—

“കൈത്തണ്ടിൽച്ചേർത്തഗണ്ഡംവഴി യിരവുകളിൽ

പ്രാരമുണ്ണിച്ച കണ്ണി-

രുൾത്താപത്താലൊലിച്ചിട്ടൊളി തെളിവു കുറ-

ഞ്ഞുള്ള രത്നങ്ങളോടേ

സ്വസ്ഥാനം വിട്ടു തട്ടാതരിയഗുണകിണ്-

ഗ്രന്ഥിയിൽപ്പോലുമുരി

പ്പേന്തും താഴുന്ന തങ്കത്തരിവള മുകളിൽ

ച്ചേർന്നിടുന്നേൻ സദാ ഞാൻ.”

(മലയാളശാകുന്തളം, അങ്കം 3.)

ഇവിടെ ശകുന്തളയിൽ അനരക്തനായ ഭാഷ്യന്തന്റെ ഉറക്കമില്ലായ്മ, കാശ്ചം, അശ്രു എന്നീ ചിന്താകാർഷ്ട്യങ്ങൾ പറയപ്പെട്ടിരിക്കുന്നു.

അനുസ്മൃതി,—

കഴിഞ്ഞ സംഭവങ്ങളെ വീണ്ടും വീണ്ടും പരാമർശിക്കുകയാകുന്നു അനുസ്മൃതി. ധ്യാനം, ദീർഘനിശ്വാസം, കൃത്യലോചനം, നിദ്രാദൈമുഖ്യം മുതലായവ അനുസ്മൃതികാർഷ്ട്യങ്ങൾ.

ഉദാഹരണം,—

“കൊണ്ടൽവേണിയൊരു രണ്ടു നാലടി നടന്ന-

തില്ലതിന്നു മുമ്പു താൻ

കൊണ്ടു ഭർത്താ കാലിലെന്നു വെറുതേ ന-

ടിച്ചു നിലകൊണ്ടുതേ

കണ്ഠവും ബത തിരിച്ചുനോക്കിയവരും വല്ല-  
ലാഞ്ചലമലച്ചലിൽ  
കൊണ്ടടക്കമൊരുമട്ടുകാട്ടി വിടുവിച്ചി-  
ടുന്ന കപടത്തെങ്ങോടേ.”

(മലയാളശാകുന്തളം, അങ്കം 2.)

ഗുണകീർത്തനം,—

സൗന്ദര്യവീര്യാദിഗുണങ്ങളെക്കുറിച്ചുള്ള ശ്ലോച ഗുണകീർത്നനം. രോമാഞ്ചം, തൊണ്ടയിടച്ച്, വിയപ്പ് മുതലായവ ആസമയത്തുണ്ടാകാം.

ഉദാഹരണം,—

“ചിത്രത്തിലാദ്യമെഴുതീട്ടയിർ ചേർത്തതാമോ?  
ചിത്തത്തിൽവെച്ചുകേൾച്ചതു രചിച്ചതാമോ?  
ബ്രഹ്മപ്രഭാവവു മവർക്കെഴുമാവപസ്സു-  
മോമ്മിക്കിലീയൊരബലാമണിസ്സൃഷ്ടി വേറെ.”

(മലയാളശാകുന്തളം, അങ്കം 2.)

ഉദ്ദേശം,—

മനസ്സുകിടന്നു പിടയ്ക്കുകയാണ് ഉദ്ദേശം. “മനസു കമ്പ ഉദ്ദേശം” എന്നു രസാർണ്ണവസുധാകരം. “ഉദ്ദേശം മനസു കമ്പം” എന്നു ഉജ്ജ്വലനീലമണി. സ്തംഭം, ചിന്ത, അശ്രു, വൈവർണ്ണ്യം, ദൈന്യം, അരതി മുതലായവ അതിന്റെ കാര്യങ്ങളാകുന്നു. “കാമ ക്ലേശജനിത സകലവിഷയരോധതാജ്ഞാനമുദ്ദേശം” എന്നു പറയുന്ന രസമഞ്ജരികാരന്റെ പക്ഷത്തിൽ അരതിതന്നെയാണുദ്ദേശം.

ആ പക്ഷത്തിൽ,—

“ഉത്സാഹക്കുറവുണ്ടു കാണത്തെയിതേ, കൃത്യങ്ങളിൽ സ്സർപ്പവും  
സത്സാരസ്വമെഴുന്ന വാക്കു മരുളിച്ചെയ്യുന്നതില്ലൊന്നുമേ  
ചിത്സാരൂപമെഴുന്ന് കൊതിപ്പൊരുജനത്തെപ്പോലെ യെല്ലൊയ്ക്കാഴും  
വത്സാധീശപര, ചിന്തകൊണ്ടു ദിവസം പോക്കുന്ന കഷ്ടം ഭവാനു.”

(ഇന്ദുമതിസ്വയംവരം, അങ്കം 1.)

വേറെ,—

“കളിക്കുമുണിനും തീരെ കളിക്കും കൊതിയറുപോയ്  
വെളിക്കു യാത്രയും തീൻ വിളിക്കുള്ളൊരു മുളലും.”

(ഉമാകേരളം, സർഗം ൫.)

ഇത്യാദി ഉദാഹരണമാവാം. മനസ്സിന്റെ പിടിച്ചുലാണെന്ന പക്ഷത്തിൽ,

“ഒന്നിലും ഫലമില്ലാതെ നിന്നിരുന്നു കിടന്നവൾ  
വന്നിടും മാലിൽ വെട്ടേററു കുന്നിനൊപ്പം പിടിച്ചുതേ.”

(ഉമാകേരളം, സർഗം ൫.)

വിലാപം,—

പ്രിയജനങ്ങളെ ഉദ്ദേശിച്ചു് ഓരോന്നുപറഞ്ഞു് ആവലാതിപ്പെടുകയാണു് വിലാപം. ചിന്ത, അശ്രു മുതലായവ അതിന്റെ കാര്യങ്ങൾ.

ഉദാഹരണം:—

• “ഇത്തരം വിപ്രയോഗാഗ്നി ഹൃത്തടത്തിൽ ജ്വലിക്കുവേ  
അത്തയ്യൽ പലതും ചൊല്ലി-യത്തലാൻ കഴങ്ങിനാൾ.”

(ഉമാകേരളം, സർഗം ൫.)

ഇത്തരം=“എന്നു ഞാൻ കാന്തനെക്കാണും—” എന്നു തുടങ്ങിയവ.

“പുരഹര, പരകെങ്ങു പോയി നീ യെ-  
ന്നുഴറി വെറുംഗളവും പുണൻകൊണ്ടു്  
ഉണരുവളിവളൽരാത്രിനേരം  
നിമിഷമടച്ചൊരു കൺ തുറന്നു വേഗാൽ.”

(കുമാരസംഭവം, സർഗം ൫.)

ഇത്യാദിയും ഉദാഹരണമാവാം.

ഉന്മാദം,—

സൂചു്ത പ്രിയജനഭ്രാന്തി ഉന്മാദം എന്നു ചിലർ. പ്രിയജനെ കമനസ്കൃതയാലുള്ള ചിത്തവിഭ്രാന്തി എന്നു പലർ. ദീർഘനിശ്വാസം, നിന്നിമേഷസ്ഥിതി, അനിമിത്തസ്ഥിതി, ധ്യാനം, ഗാനം, മെഴുനം, ഇഷ്ടവസ്തുഭേഷം മുതലായവ അതിൻകാര്യം.

ആദ്യപക്ഷത്തിൽ ഉദാഹരണം,—

“തവാധരാമൃതം വേണം ജവാലെന്നവളോതവേ  
ശിവാന്യോഗം ചെയ്തില്ല നവാധിയൊടു റാണിയും.”

(ഉമാകേരളം, സർഗം ൪.)

രണ്ടാമത്തേതിൽ,—

“മരമേ നായകൻ വാഴും പുരമേതെന്നരയ്ക്കകിൽ  
വരമേതും തരാം മൗനം ചിരമേവം ഭജിയ്ക്കാലാം.”

(ഉമാകേരളം, സർഗം ൪.)

വ്യാധി,—

കാമജപരമാണ് വ്യാധി. ശരീരം ചുട്ടുനീരുക, ദീർഘമായി  
നിശ്വസിക്കുക, ശീതോപചാരം ഫലപ്പെടായ്ക്ക, ഗ്ലാനി, മുർച്ഛ മുതലായവ  
അതിന്റെ കാര്യം.

ഉദാഹരണം,—

“മറും ശീതോപചാരാത്മം പരും പല പദാത്മവും  
മറുമാവധുവിന്നുൾത്തീ-പറുവാൻ വിറകായിതേ.”

“വിഷപ്പടി പടന്നോരീ വിഷമവ്യാധി നീങ്ങുവാൻ  
ഭിഷഗ്വരൻ പണിപ്പെട്ടാൻ; തുഷം കാററിനെ നിർത്തുമോ.”

(ഉമാകേരളം, സർഗം ൪)

ജഡത,—

ജഡത=ജാഡ്യം. ചോരിച്ചാൽ ഉത്തരം പറയാതിരിക്കുക,  
പറഞ്ഞാൽ കേൾക്കാതിരിക്കുക, തൊട്ടാൽ അറിയാതിരിക്കുക, കണ്ണിനു  
മുമ്പിലുണ്ടായിരുന്നാലും കാണാതിരിക്കുക, ധ്യാനം, വൈവർണ്ണ്യം, നി  
ശ്വാസം, കാർശ്യം മുതലായവ കാര്യങ്ങൾ. ഉദാഹരണം:—“കളിക്ക  
മുണിനും—” എന്ന പദ്യത്തിലെ “വിളിക്കുള്ളൊരു മുളലും” എന്ന  
നാലാംപാദം.

മൃതി,—

മരണോദ്യമത്തെയാണ് മൃതിയെന്നു പറയുന്നത്. മരണം  
കരുണവിപ്രലംഭപ്രഭേദത്തിൽ മാത്രമേ വണ്ണിക്കാൻ വഴിയുള്ളൂ. പുന  
രജീവനമില്ലാത്തപക്ഷം മൃതിയോടുകൂടി ശൃംഗാരത്തിന്റെ കഥ

കഴിഞ്ഞുപോകുമല്ലോ. പുനരുജ്ജീവനമുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ അതു കരുണവിപ്ര  
ലംഭമെന്ന പ്രഭോദനരവുമാണ്. അതുകൊണ്ടാണ് ചിലർ മൃതി  
യുടെ സ്ഥാനം മുർച്ഛയ്ക്കു കൊടുത്തിരിക്കുന്നതും. ആത്മഹത്യാഭ്യമ  
ത്തിനുപുറമേ മന്ദാനിലചന്ദ്രികാദിസേവ മുതലായവയും ഇവിടെ മര  
ണോദ്യമകാൽപ്പങ്ങൾ തന്നെ.

ചേടി—(കണ്ടിട്ട് സംഭ്രമത്തോടുകൂടി) ആയുന്മാരേ, രക്ഷിക്ക  
ണേ! രക്ഷിക്കണേ! എന്റെ പൊന്നുതമ്പുരാട്ടി ഇതാ തന്നെത്താനെ  
കെട്ടിത്തൂങ്ങി മരിക്കുവാൻ ഭാവിക്കുന്നു.

നായകൻ—എവിടെയാണ്? എവിടെയാണ് നിന്റെ പൊ  
ന്നുതമ്പുരാട്ടി.

ചേടി—ഇതാ ഈ അശോകക്കൊമ്പിൽ.

നായകൻ—(കണ്ടിട്ട് സന്തോഷത്തോടുകൂടി) ഹാ! ഹാ!  
എന്റെ ആശാലയയ്ക്കു വിശപ്പായി പട്ടുവാൻ ഇട്ട പൊന്നോമൽ  
പ്പന്തൽ തന്നെ ഈ തമ്പംഗി. (നായികയുടെ കൈ പിടിച്ചു ലതാ  
പാശം വിട്ടുവിട്ടുകൊണ്ട്,

“അതതതയായി മുശല, സാഹസം ചെയ്യാലാ; നിൻ  
കരതളിരിതമാറു വള്ളി കൈവിട്ടമന്ദം  
പരുഷത മലരൊന്നിന്നാഞ്ഞുപ്പാറമില്ലാ-  
ഞ്ഞൊരു ഭുജമരുളാമോ പാശമുട്ബന്ധനാത്മം.”

(നാഗാനന്ദം, അങ്കം 2.)

“തിങ്ങും ഭ്രാന്തെപ്പയസ്സംകാരമതഖിലദിഗ്-  
ന്തത്തിലും പൊങ്ങിടേ

മങ്ങാതേ മന്ദ മന്ദം മലയവനജനാം

വായുവും വീശിടേ

പൊങ്ങും തേന്മാവുതോറും കുയിലുകൾ സമദം

പഞ്ചമം കൂകിടേ

തങ്ങാതേ കാരിരുമ്പിൻ കഠിനതപെടുമി

പ്രാണനും പോട്ടെ പോട്ടെ.” (സാഹിത്യഭൂഷണം.)

ഇത്യാദി യഥാക്രമം ഉദാഹരണങ്ങൾ.

ഇങ്ങിനെ കാമാവസ്ഥകൾ പത്താണെന്നാണ് ഭരതാദികൾ പറഞ്ഞിരിക്കുന്നതെങ്കിലും, ശാരദാതന്യൻ തന്റെ ഭാവപ്രകാശത്തിൽ,

“ഭഗയാ മന്മമാവസ്ഥാ ഭവേൽ ചാഭഗയാഥവാ  
ഇച്ഛാൽകണ്ണാഭിലാഷശ്ച ചിന്താ സ്മൃതിഗുണസ്തൃതി  
ഉഭേഗോഥ പ്രലാപസ്ത്യാഭിനാഭോ വ്യാധിരേവച  
ജാഡ്യം മരണമിത്യാഭ്യേ ഭേദകൈശ്ചിദപഞ്ചിതേ ബുധൈഃ”  
(ഭാവപ്രകാശനം, അധികാരം 4.)

എന്നിങ്ങിനെ ഇച്ഛയും ഉൽക്കണ്ഠയുൾക്കൊണ്ട 12 ആണെന്നുള്ള പക്ഷവും ഉപന്യസിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു. എന്നാൽ ഇച്ഛയും ഉൽക്കണ്ഠയും യഥാക്രമം നാം പറഞ്ഞ അഭിലാഷം, ചിന്ത എന്നിവയിൽ പെടുന്ന താകയാൽ പ്രത്യേകം ഗണിക്കേണ്ടതില്ലതന്നെ.

“മനസഃ സ്പന്ദനൈകാഗ്രാ ഇച്ഛേതി വ്യപദിശ്യതേ  
സദ്യുന്ദിയസുഖാസപാഭോ യത്രാസ്തിത്വഭിമന്യതേ  
തൽപ്രാപ്തിച്ഛാം സസങ്കല്പാം ഉൽക്കണ്ഠാം കവയോ വിഭഃ”  
(ഭാവപ്രകാശനം, അധികാരം 4.)

എന്നിങ്ങിനെയാണല്ലോ ശാരദാതന്യൻതന്നെ ഇച്ഛയുടേയും ഉൽക്കണ്ഠയുടേയും സ്വരൂപം നിരൂപിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നത്. ഈ സ്ഥിതിക്ക് ഇച്ഛയും ഉൽക്കണ്ഠയും പ്രത്യേകിച്ചു ഗണിക്കേണ്ടതായിട്ടുണ്ടോ? മറുപിലർ ചക്ഷുഃപീതി, മനസ്സംഗം, സങ്കല്പം, ജാഗരം, കാശ്മ്യം, അരതി, ലജ്ജാ നാശം, ഉന്മാദം, മുർച്ഛ, മരണം എന്നിവയാണ് പത്തവസ്ഥകൾ എന്നു പറയുന്നു.

“ദുഃഖമനസ്സംഗസങ്കല്പാഃ ജഗരഃ കൃശതാരതിഃ  
ഹ്രീത്യാഗോന്മാദമുർച്ഛാന്താഃ ഇത്യനുഗഭശാ ഭഗ.”

എന്ന കാരിക നോക്കുക. ഇതിലെ അന്തശബ്ദം മരണവാചിയാണെന്നു ധരിക്കണം. മന്ദാരമരന്ദചന്ദ്രകാരനാകട്ടെ,

“ചക്ഷുഃ പ്രീതിർമനസ്സംഗ സങ്കല്പശ്ച പ്രജാഗരഃ  
അരതി സ്തംഭപരഃ കാശ്മ്യ ലജ്ജാത്യാഗോഭ്രമസ്തഥാ  
തത്ശ്വാത്മജിഹ്വാസാ സ്വാഭിത്യനുഗഭശാ ഭഗ.”

(മ. മ. ചന്ദ്ര. രമ്യബിന്ദു)

എന്നിങ്ങിനെ അതിൽനിന്നു ചില വ്യത്യാസം വരുത്തിയിരിക്കുന്നു. ഒട്ട് മനസ്സംഗങ്ങൾ അതായത്, ചക്ഷുഃപ്രീതിയും മനസ്സംഗവും അഭിലാഷത്തിലടങ്ങുന്നു. സങ്കല്പം ചിന്തതന്നെ. പ്രജാഗരം ചിന്താദികളുടേയും, കൃശതപം, അരതി എന്നിവ വ്യാധുഭേദഗാദികളുടേയും, ലജ്ജാത്യാഗം ഉന്നാദത്തിന്റേയും കാര്യങ്ങളാണ്. ഭ്രമവും ഉന്നാദവുമൊന്നുതന്നെ. മുർച്ഛ വ്യാധികാര്യമായി ഗ്രഹിക്കാം.

ഈ സ്ഥിതിക്ക്,—

“ചക്ഷുഃപ്രീതി മനസ്സംഗഃ സങ്കല്പോഽഥ പ്രലാപിതാ  
ജാഗരഃ കാശ്ചമരതിർലജ്ജാത്യാഗോഽഥ സംജാതഃ  
ഉന്നാദോ മുർച്ഛനം ചൈവ മരണം ചരമം വിദുഃ  
അവസ്ഥാ ദ്വാദശ മതഃ കാമശാസ്ത്രാനുസാരതഃ”

(പ്രതാപരദ്രീയം-രസപ്രകരണം.)

എന്ന വിദ്യാനാഥന്റെ ദ്വാദശാവസ്ഥാകഥനവും അഭിലാഷാദിദശകം കൊണ്ടു ചരിതാത്ഥമാണെന്നു സിദ്ധിക്കുന്നുണ്ടല്ലോ. ഇങ്ങിനെ പ്രസ്തുത ദശകത്തിന്നു മതാന്നരമപേക്ഷിച്ചു നൂനതയ്ക്കു അവകാശമില്ലായ്മയായിരിക്കണം അതു ആലങ്കാരികഭൂരിപക്ഷസമ്മതമാക്കീർന്നിരിക്കുന്നതും. ഈ അവസ്ഥകൾ വിരഹാദിവിപ്രലംഭത്തിലും ഏതാണ്ടോ കൈസ്സംഭവിക്കാവുന്നതാണെങ്കിലും ചിലർ വിപ്രലംഭസാമാന്യവിഷയമായും മറുചിലർ ശൃംഗാരസാമാന്യവിഷയമായും നിർഭേരിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതു ചിന്ത്യമായിട്ടാണിരിക്കുന്നത്. അതുപോലെതന്നെ ക്രമികതാ കഥനത്തിന്റെ സ്ഥിതിയും.

പി. കൃഷ്ണൻ നായർ.





## POETIC BEAUTY\*

By

C. KUNHAN RAJA

What is poetry? What is it that constitutes the essential elements in poetry? Is it language or is it subject matter that we call poetry? Or is it something different from both language and subject matter, something which is a union of language and subject matter, in a particular way? There is no doubt that there is language in poetry; there is also not an element of doubt about the subject matter being a factor in poetry. But language and subject matter are factors in all forms of expression in language. But here the question is—what is poetry as distinct from other forms of language expression? On this point there is plenty of material available in Sanskrit literature. As a matter of fact this is one of the subjects in the field of literary criticism on which much light is thrown by authors in the field of Sanskrit.

As a matter of fact there is no school of thought in Sanskrit Alamkāra corresponding to what can be called the formal school of literary criticism in the West. Among the two kinds of definitions given by the writers on Alamkāra, namely the one in which poetry is defined as both language and matter together and the one in which poetry is defined as language alone, the only difference is in the way in which the definition is formally stated. In substance all agree that poetry is both language and meaning. No Ālamkārika gives more importance to language at the expense of meaning in poetry, even when he defines poetry as language. In fact all such works where poetry is defined primarily as language and where the subject matter comes in only as a subsidiary to language in the formal definition, give importance in the body of the work to the subject matter and not to the language. What is it that can be stated as the subject in the definition and what is it that has to be given as the attribute of the subject? This is the only question where there is a real difference of opinion. On the

\*Portions of a course of lectures delivered under the auspices of the University of Madras in February, 1943.

general question of what is poetry, there is absolute unanimity of view.

It is Jagannātha Paṇḍita who takes an extreme view of the definition of poetry and raises difficulties if poetry is defined as both language and subject matter. In the other view, neither language nor subject matter by itself is poetry. It is the union of both that is poetry. When we speak of any aspect abiding in language, we say that poetry is beautiful language expressing a beautiful idea. When we speak of any aspect abiding in the subject matter, we say that poetry is beautiful idea expressed in beautiful language. When we say that poetry is read or that poetry is understood, the term takes into consideration only one of the two aspects in the combination, either the language or the meaning. In such usages, there is only a secondary meaning.

As I have already stated, the difference is purely of a formal nature. One school wants to emphasise that in poetry meaning has an importance which is not lesser than that of the language. Jagannātha wants a definition that will stand a logical scrutiny. There is no material difference between the two regarding the nature of poetry, or in their approach to the problem of poetic appreciation. An accurate definition is an attempt at an impossibility. Where there is an attempt at a sort of definition, it is more an attempt at describing what is meant by poetry than an attempt at the formulation of an accurate definition. The definitions presuppose that in poetry there are two distinct elements called language and matter, one being related to the other as subject and attribute.

Really it is not an intellectual, an analytical genius like Jagannātha that can be a guide to us in literary appreciation. What we want is not a logical analysis but a synthetic appreciation. Therefore to understand what poetry is, we must go not to a logician like Jagannātha, but to the poet himself. It is only a poet who can guide us in the field of poetry. If we take Kālidāsa we get a very definite view of poetry in the very first verse which that great poet has written. One can safely assert that the Raghuvamśa is the first poem of Kālidāsa when one notes the prayer and the apologies found at the beginning of this epic. The first verse is:

वागर्थाविव संपृक्तौ वागर्थप्रतिपत्तये ।

जगतः पितरौ वन्दे पार्वतोपरमेश्वरौ ॥

This is a very simple verse and I do not think that any commentator has troubled himself about an explanation of the verse. They content themselves with giving the mere word meaning along with all other verses in the epic. But the verse contains some very wonderful doctrines about poetry, and also about the function of a poet. To understand the verse correctly, we must recognise that the poet uses it at the beginning of a great epic. He knows that what is accomplished in writing poetry is "*vāgarthapratipatti*". There is no question of the poet merely collecting a few ideas in his mind and then trying to find words that are suitable to express these ideas, from the vocabulary of the language. This is not that could be meant by the term *vāgarthapratipatti*. What the poet must be praying for here is not the *pratipatti* of words and meanings. It is the mutual *pratipatti* of words and meanings that is sought for, words that are appropriate to the meanings and indissolubly connected with those meanings, and meanings that are appropriate to the words. The appropriateness is the indissoluble connection of the two, words and meanings. In ordinary language a word can convey more than one meaning and a meaning can be conveyed by more than one word. To be able to express a thought in verse, all that is wanted is a mere command of a good vocabulary so that the word selected fits in with the metre. This is the case in ordinary language. But poetic language is quite different. In poetry, an idea can be expressed only in one way and that is the words in which the poet has expressed his ideas. If the words are changed, the poetry is gone. It cannot be expressed in other words or in another order of the same words. A poet receives an idea only in a particular language form. There are no stages like forming the ideas and expressing the ideas in language. The idea arises only in a particular language form. This is the distinctive feature of poetry. It is this union of language and idea which Kālidāsa prays for in the verse quoted above.

The point becomes clear only when we think of the simile in the verse. Kālidāsa says that the union of Śiva and Pārvatī is like the union of words and meanings; and certainly he must have been thinking of such union in poetry and not in ordinary language. Kālidāsa prays for the union of words and meanings in his poetry, like which union is the union of Śiva and Pārvatī. Thus the combination of words and meanings is the *upamāna* and the union of Śiva and Pārvatī is the *upameya*. According to poetic convention, the *upamāna* is superior to the *upameya*, and Kālidāsa makes this point clear in the following verse in his Vikramorvaśīya:

उपमानस्यापि सखे प्रत्युपमानं वपुस्तस्याः । II, 3.

So, according to Kālidāsa, the ideal union is the union of words and meanings in poetry and the union of Śiva and Pārvatī is only an imitation of this. As for the union of Śiva and Pārvatī, ordinary people speak of Śiva being the right side and Pārvatī being the left side. There is the presentation of the *ardhanārīśvara*. But the *ardhanārīśvara* does not actually represent the fact accurately. The limitations of the medium of representation makes such a defective representation necessary. In the vision of a Yogin there is no such distinction like right and left sides, like Śiva being the right side and Pārvatī being the left side. To a Yogin there is only a unitary impression. Kālidāsa shows by this simile that in poetry also the analysis into language and meaning is only like the analysis of the Divine into a male form on the right and a female form on the left. In true aesthetic enjoyment, there is no division of poetry into language and matter. It is not quite appropriate to introduce the fifth *Sūtra* of the *Mīmāṃsā* in this connection, as has been done by commentators. In *Mīmāṃsā*, words and meanings are absolutely different from each other; their relation is eternal. This is all that is said in the *Mīmāṃsā*. But what Kālidāsa had in mind is that there is no division of poetry into word and meaning, into form and matter. There is only poetry. The analysis into words and meaning is purely arbitrary and artificial. By the simile, Kālidāsa further implies that the words in poetry cannot be replaced. If they are replaced we do not get poetry. What is called the world is the result of the union of Śiva and Pārvatī. No other union can be called the source of the world. There is a still further implication that the poet creates a new world through his poetry which is the union of words and meanings, like the union of Śiva and Pārvatī. It is not merely the unity of word and meaning in poetry that has been implied in this simile. There is one more very important point. God is all this. When we think of God and Goddess as the source of the Universe, we see the factors of the universe only as a multitude, not as God and Goddess. Similarly in poetry also there are various factors like sound, images, thoughts, emotions, rhythm and movement. But they are not distinct things and in a real aesthetic experience, all these are experienced as a unit. It is only in the ordinary experience that the separate elements of poetry are experienced as distinct factors, just as in ordinary experience of the world, the multitude of facts in the universe shine as distinct ones. In Yogic vision, all merge into a unitary experience,

It is this grand doctrine of poetry and the nature of poetic experience that is contained in this seemingly simple verse of Kālidāsa. The nature of poetry and the function of a poet were uppermost in his mind when he wrote this verse. And perhaps this was his first attempt at creative art. His mind continued to be full with this idea till he wrote the first eight cantos of his other epic, the Kumārasambhava. This portion is only an expansion of this idea contained in the benedictory verse of the Raghuvamśa.

The relation of language and matter in poetry is also implied in the fourth verse of the Raghuvamśa, which runs:

अथवा कृतवाग्द्वारे वंशोऽस्मिन् पूर्वसूरिभिः ।

मणो वज्रसमुत्कीर्णे सूत्रस्येवास्ति मे गतिः ॥

Here in the simile, the subject of poetry, namely, the solar dynasty is compared to a gem. The words of earlier narrators of the tales are like bores drilled into the gem. What Kālidāsa says is that in ancient narrations, there is only subject matter and language, but no art. They are like a large number of gems into which holes have been drilled, but remaining as isolated individuals. What Kālidāsa has contributed to this is the element of art, by bringing all these individual tales into a single beautiful poem, as into a necklace. The string that unites the isolated pieces into an artistic unit is his poetic genius. When gems are strung together into a necklace, the separate gems lose their individuality, their distinctive existence, and there are no holes also as separate things. One thinks only of an ornament, a work of art. Here also there is the presentation of the doctrine of art being an indivisible unit, what cannot be analysed into form and matter. This verse is usually taken as referring to the Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmiki. All the commentators interpret the word *pūrvasūribhiḥ* as meaning "sages like Vālmiki." From the very nature of the commentaries one can understand that they are not attempts at appreciation of Kālidāsa's poetry. They are only attempts at giving a sort of meaning to the text as an aid to elementary students. If this verse is read along with the first verse in the Raghuvamśa and if it is recognised that Kālidāsa was not here following a mere tradition of worshipping the guardian deity at the beginning of his work, but that on the contrary he was also explaining his notion of poetry, it can be found that in this fourth verse also he was not putting forward an apology for his possible deficiencies as a poet. In this verse he

shows that while ancient sages have only narrated, he was creating art.

In writing the *Dhvanyāloka*, Ānandavardhana was trying to understand poetry from the poets themselves, and to postulate certain theories of poetry from poetry itself. That the total impression produced on a reader when he reads a poem is really what must be called poetry and that poetry is neither the language nor the matter nor even a combination of the two—this position, he says, he has taken from Vālmiki, the first poet according to Indian tradition. He includes only very few works like the works of Kālidāsa, the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata, in what he is prepared to accept as genuine poetry. After taking his stand on a passage from the Rāmāyaṇa, he implies in another passage that he has derived his inspiration from Kālidāsa also. The passage is not so very explicit on the point as the passage from the Rāmāyaṇa. In the verse:

प्रतीयमानं पुनरन्यदेव वस्त्वास्ति वाणाषु महाकवीनाम् ।  
यत्तत्प्रसिद्धावयवातिरिक्तं विभाति लावण्यमिवाङ्गनासु ॥ 1—4.

He must have been thinking of Kālidāsa. It has already been said that in the first verse of the *Raghuvamśa*, Kālidāsa has propounded a grand doctrine about the nature of poetry. Poetry is neither language nor matter. What the poet contributes is what is called art. Poetry is art. It is something different from language and matter, but manifest in language dealing with some matter.

Similarly, in the concluding verse of the *Śakuntala*, Kālidāsa gives expression to certain great theories of poetic art. The verse is:

प्रवर्ततां प्रकृतिहिताय पार्थिवः  
सरस्वती श्रुतमहती महीयताम् ।

Poetry excels even the Vedas: this is the meaning. The king contributes to man's happiness and progress, by his good administration. The Vedas contribute to this by specifically stating what shall be done and what shall not be done. The king follows what is prescribed in the Vedas. But the poet excels all of them. Through its beauty, poetry transforms man into virtue itself. It is not left to the discretion of man to be virtuous or wicked, when he is under the influence of poetry. In a State, the people have the option. According to the Veda also there is the option to do what

is good or not to do it. But in poetry there is no such choice. Man under the influence of poetry becomes virtuous, whether he wants to be so or not. That is why Kālidāsa speaks of poetry as excelling even the Vedas. The Vedas contain only language and matter. In poetry there is another element, what is called beauty which leaves no option to the readers.

Anandavardhana must have been thinking of beauty as explained by Kālidāsa when he wrote the passage:

विभाति लावण्यमिवाङ्गनासु

Kālidāsa does not dilate on the element of beauty in poetry anywhere in his works. He speaks of the beauty of poetry and its influence on man occasionally as in the last verse of the *Śākuntala*. There is a place in the *Kumārasambhava* also where he speaks of poetic beauty and its influence on man's life. The verse is:

संस्कारवत्येव गिरा मनीषी

तया स पूतश्च विभूषितश्च ॥ I, 28.

But Kālidāsa speaks of beauty in various places and from these statements we can get a clear idea of what he thought of beauty. What he spoke about beauty must be applicable to poetic beauty also. In many places he describes the beauty of human form. Let us take some of his earlier references to beauty. I consider *Meghasandēśa* to be one of his earliest work. In the second part of this small poem there is the verse:

तन्वी श्यामा शिखरिदशना पक्वबिम्बाधरोष्ठो

मध्ये श्यामा चकितहरिणीप्रेक्षणा निम्ननाभिः ।

श्रोणीभारादलसगमना स्तोकनम्रा स्तनाभ्यां

या तत्र स्याद्युवतिविषये सुष्टिराद्येव धातुः ॥ 82.

Here he tries to describe the details of the personal beauty of the consort of the Yakṣa. He speaks of each part as very beautiful and perhaps there is a hint that a beautiful form is only a combination of beautiful parts. We have seen that this is not the true doctrine of Indian aestheticians. But Kālidāsa makes his position clear in the last line of the verse. A story is a series of situations; yet a poetic narration of the series of situations produce an ultimate impression on the reader. Similarly, an enumeration of beautiful



parts is meant only to produce the ultimate impression that the heroine is to be regarded as the first in the order among the creations of the creator. He knew that what is called beauty is not a mere assemblage of beautiful parts. It is a special arrangement of beautiful parts, and is distinct from the parts themselves. Beauty is a unitary impression. So he started with an enumeration of beautiful parts to show the inadequacy of the medium at his disposal for the expression of beauty, namely, language. Then he tries to make his position clear by stating what he had in his mind, i.e., the production of an ultimate impression of beauty. This he does in the last line where he says that the heroine is the first in the order among the creations of the creator, in respect of feminine form.

Kumārasambhava is another of his early works. Here, in the very first canto, there is a detailed description of the beauty of Pārvatī. The description starts with the 31st verse and goes on to the 49th verse. Thus there are nineteen verses in which the personal beauty of Pārvatī is described. In the Meghasandēśa there was only one verse to describe the personal beauty of the heroine. This is in keeping with the nature of the two works. The Meghasandēśa is a small poem of a little over a hundred verses, while the Kumārasambhava is a big epic containing in its present available form eight cantos, but meant to be a much bigger work. So, when there is a single verse in the Meghasandēśa, we have a right to expect a few verses in the Kumārasambhava. In the Kumārasambhava, Kālidāsa starts with a description of Pārvatī's youth. There is a general statement in two verses. The first is:

असंभृतं मण्डनमङ्गयष्टेरनासवाख्यं करणं मदस्य ।

कामस्य पुष्पव्यतिरिक्तमस्त्रं बाल्यात्परं साथ वयः प्रपेदे ॥ I, 31.

Kālidāsa knew that any attempt at a regular description of the beauty of form in the case of the young Pārvatī will defeat its own purpose. He did not want to limit the beauty and the fascination of youth to anything that is within normal experience. If he associates the charm of approaching youth with any kind of human effort at beautifying, then there will be a limitation and it creates a sort of impression in the readers that the beauty, after all, is only as much as can come within our normal experience. He tries to idealise it. He takes certain things that are usually associated with charm, disentangles them from all material touches and then he tries to present the charm in an ideal way.

Ornaments are usually associated with beauty. But if a man adorns, there is the limitation of human capacity to bring about beauty. So he says that the fascination of approaching youth is a decoration to the body, but not brought about by human efficiency; it is like some decoration that comes of itself. Every human effort brings about a limitation to this charm and so he says that in this decoration human touch is completely kept aloof.

*Āsava* is another thing which is associated with charm. Drop off from it all material aspects which gives it a name and take only the ideal element of enchantment. The beauty of approaching youth is that idealised enchantment.

Kāma's arrows produce a sense of charm in man's mind. They are some flowers and the material element in the flowers brings about a limitation to their enchanting nature. In both *Āsava* and in Kāma's arrows, the material element brings them within the sphere of man's normal experience. It is in this way that Kālidāsa tries to give a first impression of the charms of Pārvatī's approaching youth. The second verse is:

उन्मोलितं तूलिकयेव चित्रं  
 सूर्याशुभिर्भिन्नमिवारविन्दम् ।  
 बभूव तस्याश्चतुरश्रशोभि  
 वपुर्विभक्तं नवयौवनेन ॥ I, 32.

When the unadorned decoration, when the wineless enchantment, when the flowerless arrows of Kāma took their position on her body, her body began to shine absolutely perfect, became a perfect square so to say. According to Kālidāsa, tangibility, the touch of the finger, the material aspect, all these operate as a limitation on beauty and so he is trying to compare Pārvatī's beauty with aspects of beauty from which tangibility, the touch of the finger and material element can be kept aloof. In representative art, he finds painting to be the least affected by these limitations. So he says that her body appeared to be a picture made manifest with a brush. When a lotus opens itself without being touched by man's finger, there is a beauty and a freshness. He compares her body with that. According to Kālidāsa there are beautiful objects in Nature. There is beauty in art also. Even the touch of the creator might spoil the beauty of human form. That is why he says that her body might have been made manifest with a brush, like a painting.

Here in this general description of Pārvati's beauty, there is a veiled hint of what Kālidāsa thought of poetic beauty. Beauty comes from within a form and cannot be imposed from outside through decorations. This is what he has in mind when he said:

असंभृतं मण्डनमङ्गयष्टे ।

Similarly in *Āśava* also there is a material element and also another element which brings about the enchantment. In the arrows of Kāma, there is the flower element and there is another element which charms. Similarly in poetry also there is an element which transcends the thing which is usually called poetry, namely the language and the matter. It is only this transcendental element that gives us the real poetic impression. The beauty in poetry which is that transcendental element is quite different from the normal beauty brought about by external decorations, like Alam-kāras and it is quite different from what can be revealed by artificial methods. It is something which manifests itself from-within, from its own power like the beauty of a lotus. The term *caturaśraśobhi* used in the second of the two verses is very significant. He is having a verse with its four *pādas* in his mind when he used this term.

Kālidāsa knows that this ideal beauty can be manifested only in matter-objects, just as poetic beauty can be manifested only in language and matter. Therefore after this general statement, he begins a description of the actual physical form of Pārvati. He knows that the impression of beauty is quite distinct from the impressions of a large number of beautiful things. It is to make this point quite clear that he started with a statement of ideal beauty before beginning the description of the form of Pārvati. The description of the physical form of Pārvati is from foot to head in sixteen verses. The feet, the anklets, the calf, the thigh, the waist, the naval, the three lines, the breast, the arms, the neck, the face, the lips, the eyes, the eye-brows, the hair—these are the sixteen limbs described in the sixteen verses. Throughout the description there is this one note that each of these parts goes only to the make up of a complete impression of beauty. The points given in the first two verses are elaborated in these sixteen verses. They are meant only as a necessary physical back-ground for the production of the complete impression, the unitary impression. Kālidāsa has still a fear that the readers may take him to mean that an assemblage of beautiful parts is what is to be called a

beautiful form. To avoid this misunderstanding, he concludes by saying:

सर्वोपमाद्रव्यसमुच्चयेन  
यथाप्रदेशं विनिवेशितेन ।  
सा निर्मिता विश्वसृजा प्रयत्ना-  
देकस्थसौन्दर्यदिदृक्षयेव ॥ I, 49.

There are beautiful things in the world. But their beauty is revealed only in proper arrangement by an artist. This is the significance of the term *yathāpradeśam viniveśitena* and *ekasthasaundarya*. As a matter of fact this is the idea he had in his earlier stages. He believed in beautiful things in the world. By a proper arrangement of the beautiful things in their proper places a beautiful whole can be made. He seems to have had the view that things were beautiful and that their beauty is manifested in a proper presentation of the beautiful things. This is just what he had said in the *Raghuvamśa*

अथवा कृतवाग्द्वारे वंशेऽस्मिन् पूर्वसूरिभिः ।  
मणौ वज्रसमुत्कीर्णे सूत्रस्येवास्ति मे गतिः ॥ I, 4.

The subject matter counted a lot in the poem. So he had to select the material from the narrations of ancient sages and his part was only to make an artistic presentation of the beautiful poetic material available in the works of ancient sages. It is the clumsy handling of the beautiful things that spoiled their beauty. It is only a poet who can detect beauty and present it in a beautiful way. The beauty of the parts, that is, the beauty of the material, counted much in art. That is why in the *Meghasandēśa* he mentioned the various beautiful limbs of the heroine in describing her beauty. That is why he described the various limbs of *Pārvatī* in the *Kumārasambhava* also. Each limb is a beautiful constituent of the beautiful whole. But a mere assemblage of beautiful things cannot make a beautiful whole. It is only the creator and the poet who can detect beautiful objects and arrange them in such a way as to manifest the beauty. This is the notion of *Kālidāsa* regarding art, as is found in the early works of the poet.

At a later stage, he has quite a different theory of poetry. In his later works, it is found that according to him beauty is some-

thing that transcends god's creation. In the early works he admitted God and poet as equals. But later, he found that in the matter of creation of the beautiful, God is a complete failure and a poet is the only agent who can create beautiful things. Beauty is something which absolutely transcends God's creations. It transcends also its environments. We cannot say what beauty is. We can only detect it if we have a faculty for it, and then we can enjoy it. Thus he says:

सरसिजमनुविद्धं शैवलेनापि रम्यं  
मलिनमपि हिमांशोर्लक्ष्म लक्ष्मीं तनोति ।  
इयमधिकमनोज्ञा वल्कलेनापि तन्वी  
किमिव हि मधुराणां मण्डनं नाकृतीनाम् ॥ Śāk. I, 17.

Instead of the artificial methods of beautifying objects, a really beautiful object gives a beauty to other objects that are normally taken as ugly and as making things associated with them also ugly. A beautiful form is something that 'cannot be described. Instead of ornaments beautifying objects, a beautiful object converts even what are called ugly things into decorations.

Here what is suggested is that there is no such thing as a subject fit for poetry. A poet can make any subject beautiful in his poem. Further what are usually called *kāvya-doṣas* are not really defects in a poem. A good *kāvya* cannot have *doṣas*. Even what are recognised as *doṣas* in ordinary poems become an embellishment in a good *kāvya*. Thus according to him the elements *saguṇa* and *sālamkāra* do not arise at all in good poetry. An *Alamkāra* becomes beautiful only in a good poetry. It is the poetry that beautifies an *Alamkāra*, instead of the *Alamkāra* giving beauty to poetry. This idea has been expressed in another verse:

आभरणस्याभरणं प्रसाधनविधेः प्रसाधनविशेषः ॥ Vikr. II, 3.

Beauty gives a peculiar charm to decorations and ornaments. Similarly *Alamkāras* and *Guṇas* shine only in a good poem. They have nothing to contribute to a good poem.

When in a later poem, namely, the *Śākuntala*, the king describes the beauty of *Śakuntalā*, Kalidāsa recalls what he had already said about *Pārvatī*, in the verse:

चित्रे निवेश्य परिकल्पितसत्त्वयोगा  
 रूपोच्चयेन विधिना मनसा कृता तु ।  
 स्त्रीरत्नसृष्टिरपरा प्रतिभाति सा मे  
 धातुर्विभुत्वमनुचिन्त्य वपुश्च तस्याः ॥ II, 9.

This must be compared with the two verses in the Kumārasambhava:

उन्मीलितं तूलिकयेव चित्रं  
 सूर्योशुभिर्भिन्नमिवारविन्दम् ।  
 बभूव तस्याश्चतुरश्रशोभि  
 वपुर्विभक्तं नवयौवनेन ॥ I, 32.

and

सर्वोपमाद्रव्यसमुच्चयेन  
 यथाप्रदेशं विनिवेशितेन ।  
 सा निर्मिता विश्वसृजा प्रयत्ना-  
 देकस्थसौन्दर्यदिदृक्षयेव ॥ I, 49.

After recalling the ideas already given expression to in his earlier work, the Kumārasambhava, namely, that the beautiful form may have been created after drawing it as a painting and then giving it life with all the beautiful things in this world, he says that the creator is not competent to create the ideal beauty. We all know what beautiful things are available in the world. The creator of such beautiful things cannot be the creator of the ideal beauty. This is the idea behind the second half of the verse in Śākuntala:

स्त्रीरत्नसृष्टिरपरा प्रतिभाति सा मे  
 धातुर्विभुत्वमनुचिन्त्य वपुश्च तस्याः ॥

Sometimes the *aparā* in this second half of the verse is taken only as a distinct mode of creation of the creator himself. Really it should mean something different from what the creator is able to create. It is not the creator of this material world that can be the creator of Śākuntalā's beauty. It is the same idea that we find in

the sixth canto of the Raghuvamśa, which must be a very late work of Kālidāsa.\*

तस्मिन् विधानातिशये विधातुः  
कन्यामये नेत्रशतैकलक्ष्ये ।

The passage does not refer to any creation of the creator which excels his other creations. The passage means something which excels the creations of the creator. It is only in the imagination of a poet that the beauty of Śākuntalā and of Indumatī could be created. There is nothing corresponding to it in the actual world and it far excels the most beautiful object in the world. The difference between the ideal beauty created by the poet and the best beauty in the creator's creations is not one of degree. It is an absolute difference.

The same idea that in poetry there is no such thing called a subject fit for poetry, is brought out in the passage in the Śākuntalā:

यद्यत्साधु न चित्रे स्यात् क्रियते तत्तदन्यथा ।  
तथापि तस्या लावण्यं रेखया किञ्चिदन्वितम् ॥ VI, 14.

Even bad things can be made beautiful in a picture. Yet even in such a picture Śākuntalā's beauty is not fully brought out. It is only somewhat brought out.

According to Kālidāsa it is this ideal beauty which really adorns the world and which brings ideal joy to man. It is only a poet's words that can express the ideal beauty and it is not what can be found in any object in this world. About the words of a poet he says:

प्रभामहत्या शिखयेव दीप-  
स्त्रिमार्गयेव त्रिदिवस्य मार्गः ।  
संस्कारवत्येव गिरा मनीषी  
तया स पूतश्च विभूषितश्च ॥ Kum. I. 28.

\*My own view is that Kālidāsa first wrote the first one or two cantos of the Raghuvamśa; then he expanded the idea contained in the first verse of the Raghuvamśa in the first eight cantos of the Kumārasambhava and then took up the later cantos of the Raghuvamśa. He finished the Raghuvamśa in eight cantos. He did not finish the Kumārasambhava; he left it at the end of the eighth canto.

Here he makes it quite clear that it is not the words of any poet that purifies and gives joy. The expression *saṃskāravatyā* is very significant. It is true that what is expressed in this verse is that the beautiful composition of a poem adorns and purifies a poet himself. But the other points raised make his idea quite clear. A well burning flame is a decoration to the lamp itself and purifies also the lamp. But its ultimate purpose is the joy of the world. Similarly the Gaṅgā in heaven primarily adorns and purifies the heavenly region. But ultimately, the joy is for the virtuous people who later go to heaven. Similarly poetry primarily adorns and purifies the poet; but ultimately it is the world that is purified and that is delighted by the poetry of a great poet.

From these references to beauty, we can understand that Kālidāsa had a high opinion of the position and function of a poet. At first he considered a poet as an equal of the creator. Later he recognised his position as far higher than that of the creator himself. He specifically speaks only of the beauty of form; but it can be found that he was also thinking of poetic beauty when he described the beauty of human form, *lāvanya*. So when Ānandavardhana compares beauty in poetry to *lāvanya*, it is quite plain that he had the works of Kālidāsa in his mind and that he derived his inspiration in developing his own doctrine of *Dhvani*, not merely from Vālmiki, which fact he clearly says in his work, but also from Kālidāsa, which fact he simply hints in his work.

I want to make one point quite clear and that is that when I spoke of two poets and one writer on Alamkāra, namely, Vālmiki and Kālidāsa and Ānandavardhana it was farthest from my mind to indicate that a notion of beauty is a speciality with these three writers. They are the most prominent in a certain field. There are others who were worshippers of beauty in the field of poetry; all the writers on Alamkāra also were trying to understand beauty and to help others to enjoy it. I have said that there are two main schools in the field of Sanskrit Literary criticism. Daṇḍin, Bhāmaha, Vāmana and others who tried to analyse the literary form and literary content of poetical works represent one of these two schools. They represent what may be styled the classical school, the school of formulating definite rules for aesthetics and trying to judge individual works from those standards. Ānandavardhana represents the other school of formulating definite rules for aesthetics and trying to judge individual works from those standards. Ānandavardhana represents the other school. I may not be far



wrong when I style him the romantic critic, who tries to judge beauty from poetry itself without applying external standards. Then there are innumerable poets also, with many works to their credit. In spite of the differences in procedure in regard to literary judgment, the result is the same; all recognise the same genius as the best in literature. Thus the difference in school has not any practical value in literary criticism. The final position is the same. Though Kālidāsa and Vālmiki stand out prominent, all the other poets are also attempting to record their impression of the beautiful. And this devotion to worship at the altar of beauty is not confined to the poets. Poetry is only one phase of the Hindu genius and in all the other phases also, we find the same religion, the expression of the Hindu genius namely worship of beauty. Poetry is only one expression of this genius.

It is very difficult to specify what is meant by the genius of a nation. Especially is this the case when we have to consider the genius of a nation having such a variety of aspects and having such a long period of history, and distributed over such a vast territory. The Hellenes were confined to a small area; they were ethnically more uniform and homogeneous; the period of Greek greatness covers only a very few centuries, say four or five. Yet it has not been possible for scholars to say definitely what Greek genius really means. Take the British genius. Here also there is an ethnic homogeneity; the country is comparatively compact; the time to be taken into account is not very vast, say only five centuries. Still, can we quite definitely say what the genius of the British is? So, when we speak of the Hindu genius we are talking of a very indefinite term, more indefinite than the term poetry. There is no particular trait that is common to all the people who lived in this vast country for a period running to many milleniums.

Still, just as we were able to say what we mean by poetry, it is not impossible to say what the Hindu genius is. When I speak of Hindu genius, I do not mean a religion. I mean only a nation, the Indian nation. In judging what the genius of a nation is, we are not concerned with the life of each and every individual. Past history is past history; we do not know everything of the past; when we look at this immense past, is there anything which persists when many things are changing? Is there anything which strikes us more prominently than others? If we can say what it is that strikes us as prominent in what the Hindus have left behind, then we have said what the Hindu genius is. The prominence

also is relative and changes with the attitude of the person who looks. Max Muller, who is one of the earliest who tried in the modern times to present what impressed him as the most prominent feature in the Hindu civilization, has said that the Hindus are a nation of philosophers. To many people India impresses as the land of the religions, the birth-place of Hinduism, Jainism and Buddhism, the land that gave shelter to the Jews and to the Parsees when they were persecuted, the land that welcomed the Christians and the Muslims. They say that religion is the genius of the Hindus. The western nations were attracted to the country not by its philosophy nor by its religion but by its wealth. India was trading with the western countries ever since there was civilization in India; India was the centre of ancient world. Indians migrated to other countries to trade and to conquer and if Indian civilization also migrated along with it, it was only as an accident; it is not the fruit of any design. Mathematics, astronomy, medicine, tales and fables and all other sides of India's intellectual contribution to the world found their way to the western world because there was trade between India and the west. If Chinese pilgrims came to India in search of religious wisdom, there was the trade that gave them the necessary guidance in their travels. Can we not say that trade and conquest were also aspects of Indian genius as prominent as religion and philosophy?

There is no conflict between religion and philosophy. But there is a real antithesis between religion and philosophy on one side and trade and conquest on the other side. But we find both the sides equally prominent in the heritage of India. Then how are we to judge India's genius? It is this very antithesis that has given me the right clue to say what the Hindu genius is. If I say that a sense of harmony is the genius of the Hindus, then this antithesis vanishes. What is conspicuous in the Hindu genius is the ability to harmonise what are usually kept as distinct factors which cannot be reconciled. There is usually held to be a conflict between the interests of the other world after death and demands of man in this life, between art and morality, between reason and religion and between various other pairs. But in the Hindu genius all these factors are brought together into a very harmonious unit. And it is this harmony that we call beauty. Beauty is nothing but harmony.

The earliest phase of Hindu civilization is recorded to us in the Vedic literature. The Vedic literature is supposed to be the begin-

ning of a civilization. But the fact is that the Vedic civilization is the last phase of a great civilization, which has a long history behind it, rather should have had a long history behind it. When we look at the Vedic literature, what is it that strikes us as the uppermost feature? Nature worship, which is regarded to be one of the earliest phases of human civilization, is supposed to be very prominent there. Macdonell says that fear of gods is a very conspicuous thing in the Vedas, much more conspicuous than the love and devotion to the gods. The gods according to him are more strong than benevolent.

But when we take the Vedic literature into consideration, we must trace it from later times backwards to see what could have been the traditional attitude of the Hindus to the Vedas. There are certain theories about the Vedas, which have been very much discussed in the later philosophical literature. One of them is that the Vedas are eternal; another is that the Vedas are not the compositions of man; still another is that they are of supreme authority. It is usually held that at a later time when Buddhism began to impair the authority of the Brahmins, the Brahmins began to clothe their traditional lore with a sort of special sanctity and called it *apauruṣeya*, not of human origin. They contend that in the Veda itself there is no evidence of the Vedas not being of human origin and the doctrine must be of later origin, started by a set of self-seeking people in a condition of despondency. It is none of my business to controvert any such theory, since such theories are below such honour of being seriously considered. But I have to explain what I think of the original position of this doctrine of the *apauruṣeyatva* of the Vedas. When a man has an idea and if he finds the proper language to express that idea, that statement is a *pauruṣeya* one. That person alone is responsible for the statement. But when a person in his poetic vision sees something as clothed in a language form and if he expresses that idea in those very words, then that statement really transcends the person's intellect. The person is only a medium. He is not the author. As a matter of fact every poet is only a medium for the art. It is only a poet that can vision a poetic thing and express poetry. Thus from the point of view of true aesthetic doctrine the poet is not the author; what a poet says transcends him and his limitations. Thus there must have been a tradition of the Vedic texts being real poetry, transcending the limitations of the intellect of the authors. There must have been a tradition of a distinction drawn between the poetry of those Rishis and the normal statements of the same Rishis;

if any such statements had been preserved to us. There is no reason to believe that in the Vedic times themselves there was no notion of art as a transcendental thing. Poetry is what the author knew in his poetic vision and the texts of the Vedas must have been handed down as poetry of a superior order. It is true that at a later time, there was an attempt at establishing the Vedas as of non-human origin from a purely intellectual point of view, when the idea of the Vedic texts being art had ceased to influence the Hindus. As a matter of fact, at this later time, no one who dealt with the Vedic literature as the authority on Dharma or on Truth, worried about that portion of the Veda which can be called real art; I mean the Samhitas of the Rigveda and of the Atharvaveda. They dealt with only the Yajurveda texts, the Brāhmaṇas and some catch phrases in the Upanishads. What came down as real art, as real poetry transcending the limitations of the poets' intellect ceased to be of much interest, and came in into the controversy only in so far as the entire literature inherited from that age had to be taken as a single unit. Thus what mattered in the controversy was only the *Vidhis* and *Niṣedhas*. The remaining portion of the Vedic texts came under the divisions of *Mantra*, *Nāmadheya* and *Arthavāda*, which had an authority only as being related to the *Vidhis* and the *Niṣedhas*. Thus the original idea of the super-human origin of the Vedas was lost sight of in this controversy. The fundamental basis itself was changed. From poetry of a high order, the texts became statements about liturgy and metaphysics.

If we accept that the *apauruṣeyatva* of the Vedas was originally only an aesthetic doctrine, which later became a liturgical or metaphysical theory, then the other points about the Vedas also become very easy of solution. The words of the Vedas cannot be changed; the order of the words in Vedas cannot be changed; the pronunciation and the accent of the Vedas cannot be changed. I tried to show that in poetry, what matters is not merely the ideas. If we just remember the imagery after reading the poem, then that does not constitute poetry. Any pleasure deriving from remembering the bare imagery is not the enjoyment of poetry. The words, their length, the metre, the sounds, and all such details have a great value in poetry, and are as important as the imagery. Thus all the theories which the Mīmāṃsakas held in regard to the eternal nature of the Vedas and all the necessarily accompanying theories, must at one time have been aesthetic theories, which later were converted into liturgical and metaphysical theories.

There cannot be the least doubt about the fact that in the Vedic times themselves, the Vedic poetry must have been held as poetry of a very high order. The poets themselves speak about their art. They knew about the symmetry and the artistic finish of their compositions. They regarded their compositions as works of art and not as of any religious importance unless we say that to them art was itself the religion. As a matter of fact this must have been the case. In the Vedas, we find that there was no religion other than the worship of art, the worship of beauty.

They sang of the beauties of the world, the beauty of the home, the beauty of human relations as father and son, as brother and brother and as brother and sister, as husband and wife, as lovers, as patrons and followers and in various other ways. They sang of the beauty of Nature. In every aspect of nature, whether it is the shining dawn, or of the starry nights, or of the lustrous rising sun, the bright sun at noon, the sublime sun-set, the thunder and the rain and the gale in the monsoon; they sang of the beneficent powers behind every aspect of nature, which bless humanity and make man's life happy in this world, and which guide him in an equally happy life after death: they sang of the higher regions that lie beyond the eye of man, beyond the intellect of man; they sang of truths which only the few gifted poets can vision, for the enlightenment of the less gifted.

The Rigvedic poets saw their own likeness everywhere where the ordinary man sees only dead nature. They lived a beautiful life in this world; they were living in environments of ideal beauty. Homes, dress, ornaments, food, vehicles, entertainments, sports and games, through all these, the beauty of life in the period was manifested. They loved the beauty of human form and they enjoyed keeping this beauty in beautiful surroundings by wearing costly and beautiful robes and shining ornaments. Silks, gold and gems were used in plenty.

They sang of the gods also as living under the same condition of ideal beauty. They too had forms like the forms of man, beautiful, and attractive. The gods too enjoyed everything which man loved to enjoy; food, clothes, ornaments, weapons, vehicles, sports and games, music and dancing and other entertainments. If we read the Rigvedic poetry, what strikes us as the most prominent feature is their love of beauty. The gods are pre-eminently handsome. Even the most ferocious gods are also described as handsome. I do not know if there is a single Rigvedic god who is not

in one place or other spoken of as handsome, worthy to be seen. Very few of the gods are ferocious. They are strong and powerful, and they are terrible to the enemy. But every god is lovable to the worshipper. Thus the beauty of the gods and the beauty of man's life in this world through the grace of such beautiful gods, form the real theme of the entire Rigveda.

But in this life of beauty we see nothing of epicureanism or of Bohemianism as a stain. It is not irresponsible life of revels with no thought of the needs of morality. The Greeks had a sense of beauty and they even worshipped beauty as their religion. But the Greeks had little care for morality. They were too rational. They had little of the emotional side in their life. But in the Vedas we find a perfect balance between the idea of beauty and the idea of morality. It is not necessary for me to dilate on the point of the high standard of morality that is reflected in the Vedic literature. That point has been amply and very ably dealt with by others. But the idea of beauty has not received the same attention.

It is wrong to couple the Rigveda and the Atharvaveda along with the Yajurveda and the Brāhmaṇas into a single category of literature. We can as well couple the poems of Kālidāsa and the Śrautasūtras into a single category of literature. What the later Mimāṃsakas have done is to couple the whole Vedic literature together into a single category and then to take only what they wanted and to neglect the others as subsidiary to the few statements of a liturgical nature. In the same way the Vedantins also have taken only a few expressions from the rich Upanishadic literature and the real portion of the Upanishadic literature as literature has been absolutely neglected.

When I think of the Upanishads what strikes me as the most prominent feature is the term *Ānanda*. Perhaps if we look at the complete index of the words used in the Upanishads, it may be that the word *Ānanda* is not so very prominent as some other words. But we must recognise that this is the word that has struck all the inquirers of the Upanishads, the first teachers of the Vedānta. One can very easily understand how the two other important elements in the Vedic conception of Truth, namely reality and knowledge, had become so very important in the system. Reality is the goal and knowledge is the means to reach the goal. In the Vedānta, the difference between the journey and the destination is eliminated and we have a combination of Sat and Chit. But what is the claim of *Ānanda* in this? *Ānanda* is the fruit of art. Unless we recognise

the great part which art played in the life of the Vedic Hindus, we cannot understand how this *Ānanda* also secured such a very prominent place in the notion of the Highest Reality. What art procures for man must have been considered the ideal of man, namely *Ānanda*. That was the goal of man's life and this goal had such a hold on the thought of the time, that in the inunciation of the final goal, *Ānanda* had been assigned a position along with Existence and knowledge. There are many other ideas which could have come along with this postulation of the final goal, ideas like *kaivalya*, *nirvṛti*, *Śānti*. But the idea that the world is a place of misery, that life itself is a series of sins and the ideal is to get release from this place of sins is a later idea in Hinduism; it has not a place in real Hinduism. According to Hinduism, the world is beauty and so the fruit of this beauty, namely, *Ānanda*, is the real goal. The Upanishadic philosophy is supposed to be pessimistic. But the presence of this one idea in the inunciation of man's goal is enough to disprove the contention. *Ānanda* cannot be dissociated from art and the presence of this word in the upanishadic ideal is enough to establish the position which art occupied in the life of the Upanishadic Hindu. Thus I have tried to indicate, though I may not have been able to prove, that both in the Vedas and in the Upanishads, the prominent idea is that of the beauty of life and the value of art in life.

We cannot say that in Buddhism, the prevailing idea is one of the love of beauty. The world is condemned as a place of misery. Life is taken as a series of sins. The ideal of man is to escape from this sin. The world and all that it implies must be kept away from man's life. Ideas like *nirvṛti*, *kaivalya*, *Śānti* began to creep into doctorines of the Hindus. Life as a positive factor began to repel the thinkers. Buddha's life is the ideal.

But the influence of the Vedic tradition was very strong and the national genius could not be destroyed by such a temporary set-back. There was a national revival. And the revival of the Vedic culture was the main factor in this national revival. "Back to the Vedas" was the cry. We find a regeneration of the artistic ideal in life being preached by all the thinkers. The Vedic civilization became the ideal for this revival movement. We can scrutinise any corner of this revival movement. We will find the ideal of the beauty of life as the most prominent part. Buddha, born a prince and heir to the throne, married and father of a son, left off his home, discarded his family, abandoned his claim to the throne and wandered in the free world. Such a Buddha was

raised to the level of a god in the interim Hindu religion. In the revived religion, Brahma, Vishnu and Maheswara reappeared. Brahma had his consort, Saraswati, the goddess of learning and of art. Vishnu had his two consorts, the world (Bhūmi) and the wealth of the world (Śrī). Siva is the one god of the Hindu Trinity who may be taken as being too anti-worldly, as being an approximation to the Buddhistic ideal of renunciation and *Tapas*, and Siva has Pārvatī as his consort. The conquest of Māra in the Buddhistic tradition was given a new meaning, as is found in the Kumārasambhava. It is only a prelude to the final union of the God and His consort. Sree Rama, an incarnation of Vishnu, fought for his consort who was stolen; he chased the culprit and killed him; he recovered his consort and came back to the country to sit on the throne. Sree Krishna, another incarnation of Vishnu, had also two consorts, Rukmiṇī and Bhāmā, besides many thousands and he was the helper of the Pāṇḍavas who fought for their rights in the country. Thus the Buddhistic ideal of the divorce between God and the world was repudiated and the unity of the Universe as consisting of the Divine and the worldly, and the harmony between the two was re-asserted. Thus the world as art became the religion of this Hindu revival.

The image of Buddha may be contrasted with the image of the Hindu gods. The half-nude body of Buddha, with his shaven head, divested of all ornaments, showing the anti-worldly nature of the religion symbolised by him, may be contrasted with the images of Vishnu and Sree Krishna. The profusion of ornaments, the silk robes, the consorts, the weapons, all are characteristic of the Hindu philosophy.

The Mahābhārata began to narrate the tales of ancient Vedic kings, who lived a full life in this world, discharging their duties as kings by protecting the subjects, defeating their foes, securing plenty for the country, and who in the end, as a result of their virtuous life on earth, went to the same heaven to which penance and renunciation are supposed to lead men. Descriptions of big palaces and mansions, rich cities, luxury in the life of the people, profusion of gold and gems and silks and other articles of luxury loomed large in this narration. The Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa set the standard and the other Purāṇas followed their lead. The poets began to vie with each other in their ability to describe the beauty of the world and the life in it. If we read all the Purāṇas and all the *Kāvya*s including the dramas, we again find the



same doctrine of the world being art which we found in the Vedas again revived.

If the Upanishads explain the philosophy of the Vedas, then that philosophy is one of the worship of beauty and *Ānanda* is the essence of that philosophy. If one is asked to explain in one word what the Upanishadic philosophy of the Vedas is, there is no doubt about it that the word that will satisfy the context is *Ānanda*. Similarly, in the *Kāvya*s, including the dramas, we see the philosophy of art in the doctrine of *Rasas*. Among the *rasas*, the chief position is given to *Śṛṅgāra*. If Buddhism had been able to establish itself in India, and if a literature arose in the country representing the Buddhistic ideals of life, it is impossible that *Śṛṅgāra* would have found a place in the literary criticism of the country, to say nothing of its being given the first place among the *Rasas*. *Śṛṅgāra* is essentially connected with beauty. There is no literature in the world, ancient or modern, which gives the same place in the literature to *Śṛṅgāra* which the classical Sanskrit assigns. As a matter of fact there is no word in any language which has the same significance as *Śṛṅgāra*. Bhoja goes to the extent of saying that *Śṛṅgāra* is the only *Rasa*. This doctrine of *Śṛṅgāra* has been raised to the level of a high philosophy. This philosophy of *Śṛṅgāra* corresponds in the general classical Sanskrit period culture to what the Upanishadic philosophy of *Ānanda* is in the Vedic culture. I think that *Śṛṅgāra* is the one word which will represent the whole philosophy of the Classical Sanskrit period. From the earliest times onward, although other *rasas* have been recognised, yet the details are developed and explained in reference to the *Śṛṅgāra rasa*. Take the *Nāṭya Sāstra* of Bharata, which is supposed to be the earliest text on the subject; there also the *vibhāvas*, *anubhāvas* and other factors have primary reference to *Śṛṅgāra*.

According to the philosophy of *Śṛṅgāra*, this *rasa* is taken to represent the relation of god to man, of the Lord to the devotees, of the supreme self to the individual selves, of god to the world. In Sree Krishna, the incarnation of Vishnu, we see the ideal *Śṛṅgāra rasa*. The relation of the Gopis to the Lord is one coming under the *Śṛṅgāra rasa*. Thus *Śṛṅgāra* is lifted far above the level of the ordinary worldly experiences. It is raised to the realm of the divine and is supposed to govern all the laws of nature. The Greeks are supposed to have been worshippers of beauty. But their literature does not develop this aspect of aesthetic experience. Take the plays of the great Greek dramatists; there is no *Śṛṅgāra* there. There may be beauty in their temples, in their statues, in

their homes, in their physical formation developed as a studied art, in their dress and in all such things and yet their life is not one of art; there is no exhibition of the essence of art, namely this human relation governed by beauty, the *Śṛṅgāra Rasa*. There may have been beauty in Greek life, but Hindu life was beauty itself.

Take the various cults that have been developed in the land as a result of this revival of vedic civilization from the Buddhistic field. There is the Lalita worship. Take the Lalitāsahasranāma. There, it is beauty that occupies the most conspicuous position. Pārvatī, whose aspects the other goddesses are, is herself the ideal beauty. She is the goddess of *Maṅgala*. She is half the God, God being only another half. The *Ardhanārīśvara* represents the ideal of art, and I tried to indicate in a previous section how Kālidāsa understood *ardhanārīśvara* as only art, and how the whole world is art. Dance and music form the essence of the Krishna worship. Krishna's flute and Krishna's *Rāsa* dance form the whole theme of Krishna worship. Apart from these two important incidents in the life of Sree Krishna, there is the killing of Kāliya. Here also it is as dance that it is described. Thus it is shown that it is dance that destroys the evils of the world. The blessing to the world represented by the flute and the *Rāsa* dance and the destruction of evil represented by the killing of Kāliya, all of them take the form of art. Thus the life of Sree Krishna too is a presentation of art, is a form of the worship of beauty.

I have already said that Brahma is wedded to art, in so far as Saraswati is the goddess of art. In Siva also, the dance and the rhythm are the chief factors in his manifestation. If he is the destroyer of Kāma, he is *ardhanārīśvara*. Both the *ardhanārīśvara* and the Natarāja aspects, the two most important aspects of Siva, are aspects of art, of dance, rhythm and harmony.

Then when we come to philosophy, we find the same love of art quite manifest there also. We must differentiate the six systems and the sectarian systems. Of the sectarian systems, I have already said something. In the sectarian systems, god is conceived of as united to the goddess who is the embodiment of beauty and the relation of the god to the goddess is one of harmony, which is the essence of art. Dance and music play a very important part in all such systems. In the so called purely rational systems also, we find the play of art. Buddhism started on a purely intellectual analysis of the position in this world and arrived at the conclusion that the world must be a misery, or that the world

is not a reality, the unreality being explained in various ways and postulated as of different degrees. The antithesis between the spirit and the matter is a cardinal factor in Buddhism. In all the six systems, the cardinal principle is the reality of the world and the harmony between spirit and matter.

Take for example the Samkhya system. According to this system, the whole world is like a stage. The Prakriti is the dancer and the Purusha is the spectator. The purpose of the Prakriti is to lead the Purusha to the ideal condition, thereby indicating that in art also the goal is just what religion and philosophy postulate as their goals, namely, ideal happiness to the self. The whole importance of the Samkhya philosophy, in literary criticism, or rather in aesthetic criticism, is this simile of dancer brought in to represent Prakriti. Unless the whole nation had been living in an atmosphere of art, it is inconceivable that in a system of philosophy, such a simile should have found this prominent place. There is no touch of pessimism in the Samkhya philosophy. "The world is not an evil. The purpose of life in the world is to attain the ideal happiness and the world is the best means for that goal. Life is one of beauty like dance on the stage. Life is art itself. I need not specially comment on the aesthetic aspect of the Yoga system. The whole philosophy is one of harmony in experience. This has been adequately dealt with and the element of harmony in the Yoga system has been well recognised. In the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and in the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā, one may not find much of aesthetic elements, as in the case of the Samkhya and the Yoga systems. But the reality of the universe, consisting of both spirit and matter and the spirit being an integral part of the universe along with matter, brings in an element of harmony into the systems. In the Vedānta, the presence of the element of *Ananda* in the conception of Brahman is enough to give it an art touch, and this point has been developed in connection with the philosophy of the Upanishads. The reality of the world is a cardinal aspect of all the branches of the Vedānta. In the Advaita, matter and spirit have the same reality. If matter is only *vyāvahārika sattā*, spirit as a counter-part of matter in the universe is no better. If Brahman is real, matter, as much as spirit, is a modification thereof. The reality of the world in the other schools of the Vedānta is well known. The element of personal beauty in the conception of God in the other schools is also well recognised. What I wanted to emphasise is that in India the element of art is so very prominent in the national life that there is no aspect of thought in which this

art is not reflected. I made only a casual and general survey of the various aspects of the national life and the thoughts of the nation, and I have shown that everywhere there is the touch of art as a very prominent factor. I have not made a complete survey of the entire field of Indian thought. I have made only a selection, taking certain representative specimens, like religion and philosophy, besides literature and literary criticism. There are various fields, less prominent than these where too we find the same reflection of the all encompassing art in the life of the nation. I shall give certain examples.

Take the Indian names for example. Can we find a better example of a sense of beauty. Perhaps the Greeks had the same sense, though not to the same extent. The Greeks had beautiful names. Take for example Aristocrates (noble power), Cleomenes (famous might), Aristonoe (noble mind) and so on. I think that we get similar names in Indian literature also. But take the Roman names. Fabius means a beanman; Cicero means a peaman. I am not going to give the names of Rishis or Kings found in the Vedas and the Puranas. I want to draw your special attention to the fictitious names introduced by poets in their compositions, which reveal more clearly the general level of artistic sense in the nation. Take Anasūyā and Priyamvadā or Parabhṛtikā and Madhukarikā in the Śākuntalā. Take Kaumudikā, Bakulāvalikā, Irāvati and Nipuṇikā in the Mālavikāgnimitra. Take Madayantikā and Lavan-gikā in the Mālatīmādhava. Take Kāncanamālā, Susaṅgatā, Cūlatatikā, Madanikā and Nipuṇikā of Ratnāvalī and Caturikā and Mohanikā of Nāgānanda. Take the names of Heroines like Vasantasenā, Ratnāvalī etc. Is there no art in such selections? Compare these names with any names in any language of the world. I think I can risk a statement that in the whole world, India provides the best specimens of beautiful names for men and women. And there must be some sense of art behind such a selection. Compare such names with Wood and Smith and Jack. Even in such a thing which is likely to be considered a very insignificant affair, there is the full revelation of an artistic sense in the nation.

Then we pass on to the names given to books in India. We do not find such prosaic names of books like "An Introduction to" or "A Hand-Book of," or "A Manual of" and "A Primer of" in Sanskrit. The commentāry on Pāṇini is called Kāśikā and its commentary is Padamañjarī and the commentary thereof by Raṅga-nātha is Padamanjarīmakaranda. The commentary of the Mahā-

bhāṣya is Pradīpa and its commentary is Udyota. There is the Prakriyākaumudī and its Prasāda. There is also the Siddhānta-kaumudī and its commentary Prauḍhamanoramā. There is Śabdaratna on it. In the Mīmāṃsā there is the Śāstra Dīpikā, The Nyāyaratnākara, Nyāyaratnamālā, Rjuvimalā, Vārtikābharaṇa, Nyāyasudhā, Tantraśikhāmaṇi, Bhāttacandrikā, and many others. In all the other systems of philosophy and in all the Śāstras we find the same love of the beautiful. Even when a book is given a name the Indians are influenced by their love of beauty. The Aṣṭāṅga-hṛdaya has the Sarvāṅgasundarī as the commentary. Which other nation has this great love of beauty in all phases of their life? If I take a poet and his work, I have a reason to expect the love of beauty in it. But who will expect this same love of beauty in grammar, in Mīmāṃsā and in the sciences like medicine? In Śākuntala, a line like

रम्यास्तपोवनानामपगतविघ्नाः क्रियाः समवलोक्य । I, 12.

is something that we expect. But who expects such statements like

केशान् काशप्रकाशान् प्रचलदलिनिभांस्तक्षणादेव कुर्यात् ।

in a scientific treatise in any other language? And yet we find that some of the scientific works in Sanskrit are far more poetical than some specimens that are recognised as poetry. Take the portion regarding the *Madātyayacikitsā* in the Aṣṭāṅga-hṛdaya. That is one of the best specimen of poetry we can get in the whole of Sanskrit. I must in this connection say that the Aṣṭāṅga-hṛdaya is one of the best poems in Sanskrit.

Thus when we find a poet like Kālidāsa singing of the beauty of human form, of the beauty of Nature, it is a manifestation of the national genius through a great poet. It is not an isolated feature. To Kālidāsa, beauty is everything. Beauty is an index of character. Take his lines;

अकारसदृशपद्मः । Raghu I, 15.

or

अनसूये को नु खल्वेष चतुरगम्भीराकृतिश्चतुरं  
प्रियमालपन् प्रभाववानिवलक्ष्यते । Śāk, I

or

न तादृशा आकृतिविशेषा गुणविरोधिनो भवन्ति । Śāk. IV.

In all these places we find that Kalidasa associates beauty with nobility and magnanimity of character. We see more or less the same idea in:

मा भूदाश्रमपीडेति परिमेयपुरस्सरौ ।  
अनुभावविशेषात्तु सेनापरिवृताविव ॥ Ragh. I.

and

स न्यस्तचिह्नमपि राजलक्ष्मीं  
तेजोविशेषानुमितां दधानः ।  
आसोदनाविष्कृतदानराजि-  
रन्तर्मदावस्थ इव द्विपेन्द्रः ॥ Ragh. II, 7.

Kālidāsa's genius to spot beauty where no one will be able to see it is found in the line:

रम्यास्तपोधनानामपगतविघ्ना क्रियाः समवलोक्य ॥ Śāk. I, 12.

Who but a genius like Kālidāsa could associate the rituals in the hermitages of the sages with what is *ramya*. I know that this usage of Kalidasa has been a sort of shock to some and there is an attempt at emending the text to *dharmyāḥ* instead of *ramyāḥ*. And we must also recognise that Kālidāsa was addressing a critical audience in his drama and unless there was that artistic background in the form of a national worship of beauty, such a usage would have been a matter for ridicule, just as such a usage has disturbed some commentators of a later day when the artistic sense of the nation had practically died out. Thus it is from such small bits that we learn a lot about the real outlook of the nation in matters of art, and such a small line speaks far more than a whole volume on aesthetics.

I tried to make a short survey of the whole period of Indian History and the whole field of Sanskrit literature to show that love of beauty was one of the most prominent features in the Hindu genius. As I stated when I started this subject, I do not mean to say that every Indian of every period was an artist or a worshipper of beauty. I did not mean that all the people developed a fine well-proportioned body, wore beautiful dress, lived in well furnished and artistically arranged homes with beautiful gardens, that they went out through beautiful streets, enjoyed music and dance, composed poems or at least appreciated poetry, admired statues and paintings and spent their whole life in such a way. That is not what I meant. My whole thesis is that when we look at what has remained to us of the ancient civilization in India, the element of beauty and a sense of beauty are the most prominent features that remain as enduring factors in their culture. It is only when we understand this aspect of Indian culture, or rather it is only when we understand Indian culture in this aspect, that we can really appreciate an author like Kālidāsa.

UDĀLI'S COMMENTARY ON THE RĀMAYANA.  
THE DATE AND IDENTIFICATION OF THE AUTHOR AND  
THE DISCOVERY OF HIS COMMENTARY.

By

DR. V. RAGHAVAN, M.A., PH.D.

*References in Govindarāja.*

In my paper on Uḍāri (li) 's commentary on the Rāmāyaṇa in the Gopalakrishnamacharya Book of commemoration, pp. 2·05-2·20, I drew attention to the two references to Uḍāri (li) in the commentary of Govindarāja, and published also a fragment of Uḍāli's commentary for Sundara, 1-9, as found in a portion of a Trivandrum University manuscript of the Kataka on the Rāmāyaṇa. The first of the two references in Govindarāja's commentary occurs at the end of Govindarāja's gloss on the Ādityahr̥dayasarga<sup>1</sup> in the Yuddhakāṇḍa; Govindarāja says here that *this Ādityahr̥daya canto was not commented upon by Uḍāri (li)*. The second occasion for Govindarāja to refer to Uḍāri occurs in his comments on the canto<sup>2</sup> describing the return of Rāma from Laṅkā in the Puṣpaka, in connection with the well-known controversial line—

अत्र पूर्वं महादेवः प्रसादमकरोत्प्रभुः ।

(śloka 21).

which, it appears, Uḍāli read in another context and interpreted as referring to Rāma seeing his father by the grace of Mahādeva or Śiva. The implication of both the contexts shows that Uḍāli was a Vaiṣṇavite commentator.

*Two more Glimpses.*

After reading my paper, Sri S. Parthasarathi Ayyangar, Siromani, of Śrīraṅgam, who is compiling a concordance of the Vaiṣṇava Prabandha Literature, drew my attention to two citations

1. Yuddhakāṇḍa, Canto 107.

2. Yuddhakāṇḍa, Canto 126.



from Uḍāli's commentary on the Rāmāyaṇa in the commentaries on the Vaiṣṇava Prabandhas in Tamil. The first of these two references is valuable since it shows Uḍāli to be the earliest of our known commentators on the Rāmāyaṇa.

This occurs in the well-known commentary Īḍu which represents the exposition of Nampillai as recorded by one of his disciples, Vaḍakkuttiruvithipillai. It occurs under VII. V. I in the gloss on the expression 'நற்பால் அயோத்தியில்'. The commentator says that the land of Ayodhyā was so blessed that anyone born there cannot but love the Lord, Śrī Rāma; but then, how is Mantharā's dislike of Rāma to be explained? Mantharā evidently was not born in Ayodhyā and the commentator supports his answer by quoting the words describing Mantharā in the Rāmāyaṇa and the meaning which Uḍāli gives to them in his commentary: Mantharā is described by Vālmiki as 'यतोजाता' which is explained by Uḍāli as 'यतः कुतश्चिजाता' 'born somewhere, in some unknown place'.

“[நற்பால் அயோத்தியில்] - நல்ல இடத்தையுடைத்தான் திருவயோத்தியிலே. பால் - இடம். இத்தால் நிலமித்யே ராமபக்தியை விளக்குமென்கை. \* \* 'ज्ञातिदासी यतोजाता' (अयो. 7. 1.) என்கிறதினே. இதுக்குக் கருத்தென்? என்னில்,—இந்தேசத்திலே பிறந்தாளாகில் பெருமானுக்கு விவீராதம் செய்யாளாகையாலே, எங்கேனும் ஓரிடத்தே பிறந்தாள், ஒரு விழுந்தான்கிடக்கை என்கிறது.” ‘यतः कुतश्चिजाता’ என்று வியாக்யானம் பண்ணினான் உடாலி (उडालि).<sup>3</sup>. இந் நிலத்தில் பிறவாமை இவளுக்குக் கொடுமை விளைந்ததென்றானிதே.”

The second reference is not in the Īḍu itself but in its supergloss called Arumpadam or Jiyar Arumpadam, by Kuṇukkaram-bākkam Rāmānuja Jiyar. In the Īḍu on IX, V. 2, the author cites from the closing lines of the Bālakāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa in which the great love and the perfect mutual understanding of the hearts of Rāma and Sītā are described, to explain the love and understanding of the bird-couple mentioned in the line—‘நீரும் துஞ்சேவலும்’.

3. The alternative interpretation given here by Goyindarāja in the words: ‘यदा यतःकुतश्चिजाता, तदश्रीनामयोध्यायां जननासंभवात्।’ is based on Uḍāli; see below the passage from Uḍāli cited in full.

“[நீரும் துஞ்சேவலும்] - சேவலின் கருத்தறிந்து நடத்துகிற நீரும், உங்கள் கருத்தறிந்து பரிபாறுகிற உங்கள் சேவலும். ‘அந்தர்ஜாதம்-பிவ்யக்தம்’ (பால. 77. 31.) என்னுமாபோலே \* \* \* ”

Commenting on this in the Īḍu, the Arumpadavurai of Jiyar quotes the Rāmāyaṇa lines and Uḍāli's comments thereon.

“[अन्तर्जातम् इत्यादि]—

तस्याश्च रामो द्विगुणं हृदये परिवर्तते ।<sup>5</sup>

अन्तर्जातमभिव्यक्तमाख्याति हृदयं हृदा ॥

तस्य भूयो विशेषेण मैथिली जनकात्मजा । (बाल. 77. 31-32.)

இதி பாலகாண்டே ௮௭ (௭௭). அச்யாதி:—தச்யாசு ஹ்ருதயே ராம:; த்விகுணம் ப்ருசம், பரிவர்த்தி. தச்யாத் ச ராம: அந்தர்ஜாதம் பிஹ்ருதயம் அபிபிராயம், ஹ்ருதா மனசா, வ்யக்தமாச்யாதி ஜானாதி. தச்ய ராமச்ய ஹ்ருதயே, மைதிலி, ப்ருயோ விசேபேண அதிசயேன பரிவர்த்தி. தச்யாத் தச்ய ராமச்ய ஹ்ருதயே மைதிலி ப்ருயோ விசேபேண அதிசயேன, பரிவர்த்தி. தச்யாத் தச்ய ராமச்ய ஹ்ருதயம் பிபிராயம், மைதிலி, மனசா, அச்யாதி ஜானாதி. ஈததுக்தம் பவதி—பரஸ்பரஹ்ருதயாந்தர்வர்த்தனேன பரஸ்பரபாவம் உபோ ஜானித இத்யர்த்த இதி ”  
என்று உடாலி (உடாலி).

*Date of Uḍāli.*

Of the two references noted above, the first which is a citation in the Īḍu itself is of importance, as it gives us an idea of the date and antiquity of the Rāmāyaṇa-commentator, Uḍāli. Rāmanuja died in 1137 A.D. and was succeeded by Parāśara Bhaṭṭa; Bhaṭṭar, as the latter is referred to, had converted a Vedāntin named Mādhava who succeeded Bhaṭṭar; Nañjiyar, as the ex-Vedāntin Mādhava was known, was succeeded by Nambūr Varadarāja, referred to as Nampillai and Lokācārya; it is this Nampillai's exposition of the Tiruvāymoli that has been recorded as the Īḍu. The Īḍu can thus be assigned to c. 1250 A.D. The word Īḍu means 'Equal' and it is said that the commentary was so-called because it was considered 'equal' to the Śrībhāṣya-commentary Śrutaprakāśikā of Sudarśana; the Śrutaprakāśikākāra was very old when he entrusted his

4. The reading now current is अपि and not अभि.

5. The text now current reads तस्याश्च हृदये रामो द्विगुणम् ; the comments of Uḍāli also have this reading.

Śrutaprakāśikā to Vedānta Deśika (1269–1371 A.D.), and on this evidence also, we may assign the Īḍu to c. 1250 A.D. And Uḍāli whom Nampillai quotes cannot be brought down beyond 1250 A.D.

### *Identification of Uḍāli.*

For several years now, whenever I thought of Uḍāli, I was also thinking of the manuscripts of a certain commentary on the Rāmāyaṇa, found in the Madras Government Oriental Mss. Library and elsewhere also. The author of this commentary calls himself Varadarāja, but describes himself as born of Uḍāli-kula; and whenever I saw the mss. of this Ātreya Varadarāja's commentary, in the Madras Government Oriental Library—

इति प्रथमात्रेयगोत्रिणा उटालि कुलसंभवेन वरदराजेन  
चोलपण्डित ब्रह्मराजापरनाम्ना विरचिते विवेकतिलकनाम्नि  
रामायणव्याख्याने बालकाण्डस्य प्रथमसर्गव्याख्यानम् ।

Trien. Cat. R. 3409.

—I was hoping to find in this, on examination, Uḍāli's own commentary or the commentary of one of his descendants; and even if it turned out to be only a commentary by a descendent of Uḍāli, I hoped, it might contain most probably citations of the views and interpretations of Uḍāli. Fortunately however, the two citations from Uḍāli himself which I got from the Vaiṣṇavite literature in Tamil led me to an examination of this commentary,<sup>6</sup> and to the identification of Uḍāli cited by Govindarāja, and earlier by the author of the Īḍu, with the author of the Rāmāyaṇa-commentary Vivekatilaka, viz., Varadarāja of Ātreya-gotra, known also as Coḷapaṇḍita Brahmarāja, and one belonging to the Uṭalikula. The name Uḍāli which readers of Govindarāja have till now been feeling as somewhat strange, is thus not the proper name of the commentator, but his house or family name, and students of the Rāmāyaṇa and its commentaries, who have been thinking of Uḍāli's commentary as a lost work, will be glad to learn of mss. of it existing in many libraries.

6. I have to thank Dr. A. Sankaran, M.A., Ph.D., Curator, Madras Government Oriental Library now at Tirupati, for kindly supplying me some extracts from this commentary.

1. We saw first that according to Govindarāja, Uḍāli did not comment on the Ādityahṛdaya canto. The Vivekatilaka of Uḍāli Varadarāja does not have the Ādityahṛdaya canto.

2. The comparison of the citations in the Īḍu and in the Jīyar Arumpadam with the comments in the respective contexts in the Vivekatilaka of Uḍāli Varadarāja bear out the identity of Uḍāli. The comments in the Vivekatilaka on the lines at the end of the Bālakāṇḍa, तस्याश्च हृदये etc., which the Arumpadam quotes, are as follows:

“तस्याश्चेत्यादि । तस्याश्च हृदये भर्ता द्विगुणं भृशं, परिवर्तते । तस्मात् स तस्या अन्तर्जातमपि हृदयम् अभिप्रायं हृदा मनसा, व्यक्तमाख्याति जानाति । इदमुत्तरश्लोकस्य च शेषः । तस्य हृदये मैथिली भूयो विशेषेण अतिशयेन, परिवर्तते । तस्मात्तस्य च हृदयं भावं, मैथिली मनसा जानाति । एतदुक्तं भवति—परस्पर-हृदयान्तर्वर्तनेन परस्परभावमुभौ जानीत इति ।”

3. On ‘ज्ञातिदामी यतोजाता’ describing Mantharā, the comments in the Vivekatilaka are the same as found in the Īḍu:

“ज्ञातिदासोत्यादि—कैकेय्या ज्ञातीनां दासी ज्ञातिदासी । यतोजाता यतः कुतश्चिज्जाता, श्रीमत्यामयोध्यायां तद्विशयो न जायन्ते । .... ”

*Mss. of the Commentary.*

In the Madras Government Oriental Library, there are four mss. of this commentary, D. 16012, R. 1734, 3409 and 4091. D. 16012 contains the Āraṇya, Kiṣkindhā and Sundara Kāṇḍas completely and the Ayodhyā and Yuddhakāṇḍas incompletely. R. 1734 is complete, going up to the end of the Yuddhakāṇḍa, but the text in this ms. in Telugu script represents an abridged version of Uḍāli's commentary. R. 3409 contains completely the first five Kāṇḍas and a part of the sixth. R. 4091 has the Ayodhyā Kāṇḍa only.

In the Adyar Library, there is one ms. of Uḍāli Varadarāja's commentary, covering the Uttarakāṇḍa. The same ms. contains a commentary on the Ayodhyākāṇḍa also, with a few Sargas wanting in the beginning; this commentary, the ms. describes as Govindarāja's but a comparison of it with Govindarāja's shows that the commentary is not Govindarāja's, but is that of one whom Govindarāja used. Only after comparing it with Uḍāli's Ayodhyā-commentary from another known ms. can we say definitely that the Ayodhyā-portion in the Adyar ms., is also Uḍāli's.

In the Tanjore Library, there are three ms. of Uḍāli's commentary: No. 9386 (New Catalogue) takes us almost to the end of the Uttarakāṇḍa; no. 9387 goes up to the end of Sundara, and no. 9386, up to the end of the Kiṣkindhā.

In the Government Oriental Library, Mysore, (Catalogue I, 1924, p. 158), there are two Mss. of this commentary in Telugu script, the first of which is found to cover Kāṇḍas 1-6; the second is probably fuller, as it contains more leaves.

In a palm-leaf ms. of the Kataka commentary on the Rāmāyaṇa, Sundara and Yuddha, in the Śāntiniketan (No. 1456), which I have examined, the Kataka-commentary for the Yuddhakāṇḍa extends only up to a part of canto 15 at the beginning, the rest of the commentary on the Yuddhakāṇḍa being the Vivekatilaka.

#### *Uḍāli and Readings.*

From Govindarāja we know that Uḍāli does not count the Ādityahrdaya-canto, and in canto 126 of the Yuddhakāṇḍa, he mentions that the verses in this canto are found in disorder in most mss. One of the features of Uḍāli's commentary is that in the course of his gloss, he points out the readings which are to be accepted according to him. At the beginning of his commentary, in one of his introductory verses, he expressly states that owing to insufficient knowledge of the Nāgarī and other scripts, mistakes had crept into mss. and that, after an examination of mss. gathered from several parts of the country, he shows in his commentary the correct readings, 'Samyakpāṭha'.

नागरादिषु घर्णेषु नात्यन्तनिपुणैरैः ।

खण्डने स्वलितः पाठः पारंपर्येण लिख्यते ॥

अतोऽत्र सम्यक्पाठश्च तत्र तत्र प्रदर्श्यते ।

बहुदेशसमानीतबहुकोशपरीक्षणात् ॥

R. 3409. Madras Govt. Ori. Mss. Library.

A perusal of the Uttarakāṇḍa portion of the commentary in the Adyar Library shows that Uḍāli Varadarāja carries out this intention all through the work. We find him saying frequently 'इति पाठः'. On p. 827, we find 'केषुचिदंशेषु एष श्लोको न दृश्यते।' (regarding a verse about Ahalyā in Uttara, 29). On p. 838, we find regarding a verse in canto 44 of Uttara 'न चास्मिन्निति श्लोकः' ;

सान्त्वमित्यादेः परतो द्रष्टव्यः। पूर्वत्र तु प्रमादात् कृतः।' On p. 838, he says with reference to a verse in canto 45 'पुराहमाश्रमे वासमित्याद्यर्थे (?) स्यान्नन्तरमनुरूप्यामित्यादि। एतदन्यत्र प्रमादात् लिखितम्।'

*The Personality of the Commentator.*

The discovery of the identity of this commentator is of great interest to both students of literature and students of history. First of all, Uḍāli Varadarāja happens to be the earliest of the commentators of the Rāmāyaṇa whose works we now possess. Secondly, he probably, for the first time, gave expression to some of the peculiar Vaiṣṇavite interpretations, in a regular Sanskrit commentary on the Rāmāyaṇa, interpretations which we find incorporated in later Vaiṣṇava commentaries like the Govindarājīya.

Govindarāja gives his name as Uḍāri; in the colophons in the mss. we find the word as Uḍāli (R. 3409) Uḍāri (R. 1734) and Uḍhāli (Adyar Ms.). In the Īḍu and the Arumpadam, we find the name written in Tamil with a 'li' in the end and not 'ri', but whether the second letter is Ṭā or ḍā, we cannot decide. Now, this house or village name Uḍāli is found among a numerous class of Pudūr Drāviḍa Brāhmaṇas, living at present in Neilore District. Like our commentator Varadarāja, these Uḍālis of Pudūr are also of the Ātreya-gotra,<sup>7</sup> and they happen to have migrated to the Nellore region in the Cola times, as there is no village in the Nellore District of the name Uḍāli.<sup>8</sup>

That he was a renowned scholar of the times is known by two of his titles 'Cola Paṇḍita' and 'Vyākhyātr Cūḍāmaṇi' (Adyar and Tanjore Ms.).<sup>9</sup> The title 'Cola Paṇḍita' was perhaps a title conferred during the Cola times on distinguished scholars attached to the court. Besides being a scholar, Varadarāja our commentator belonged to the group of those Brahmins of the Cola times who distinguished themselves in the cause of the Cola Kings as their military generals, and were well-known by their title 'Brahma-mā-rāya', occurring in inscriptions. This is borne out by the epithet

7. They are, in common with other classes of the Pudūr Drāviḍas, of the Kaṇḍaramānikkam Bṛhaccaraṇa sect. I am indebted for this information to Dr. N. Venkataramanayya, who is a Pudūr Drāviḍa and has many Uḍāli kinsmen.

8. The Government List of villages of the Madras Presidency does not mention Uḍāli anywhere.

9. Tanjore Ms. 9386: व्याख्यातृपुंसमणिना. Adyar Ms. वाक्यार्थचूडामणिना.

found in the colophons to Uḍāli Varadarāja's commentary on the Rāmāyaṇa—

वरदराजेन चोलपण्डित-ब्रह्मराजापरनाम्ना—

Uḍāli Varadarāja was not the only Cola Brahmarāya to enrich the literary output of the Cola times. If Varadarāja expounded the Rāmāyaṇa in a Sanskrit commentary on it, the Īḍu says that there was a Karikāla Cola Brahmarāyan of Kal Brahmadēśam who wrote a commentary in Tamil on the Tamil hymns of the Ālvārs, in the midst of his public duties (Grāmakārya).<sup>10</sup> From the inscriptions, we know of another family of Cola Brahmarāyas, whose members distinguished themselves as much with the Śāstras as with the Sāstras. In Sil, Vol. 6., Nos. 127 156 (same text) dated Śaka 1073 and 1076 (A.D. 1151 and 1154), the reign of Rājārāja II, from Bāpatla, we find a 'Brahmakṣatra' family of the Mahā-Agrahāra called Śālibṛhadāṅkura (Perumpayir, modern Perumber near Madhurāntakam) in the Tuṇḍiramaṇḍala, comprising a Perumā Nambi a grammarian and a poet (सुतानिर्देशद्वारेण, सूक्तिसुक्तमणिश्रेणविष्णुः, ब्रह्मज्ञानकुलाध्वशात्किरणः), his son Sūrya, a medical man (वैद्यविद्याधरः) and Sūrya's four sons of whom the eldest Nāgadeva was a poet and the second Ananta wrote a commentary on the Nārāyaṇīya. (टीका येन पटारशुब्रयसना नारायणीयादधेः परालोकनसोत्कृष्टरिजनतायावावाहितं कृता )<sup>11</sup> The works of these Brahmin Cola generals add bright pages to the history of Literature under the Colas.<sup>12</sup>

10. By the courtesy of the Indian History Dept., University of Madras, I got this reference from the work (unpublished) of Sri S. Sundararajan, ex-Research Student in that Department. Īḍu III. 9-2; கல்பரம்ப தேசத் திலே கரிகால் சோழப் பரம்மராயன் 'திருவாய்மொழிக்கு வ்யாக்யானஞ்செய்தேன்' என்று சீயர்க்குக்காட்ட, அவன்பக்கல் உபஜீவனங்களை நினைத்து, பின்னையை 'கீர் இதைக்கேட்டு ஸம்பாவியும்' என்று அருளிச்செய்ய, அவரும் கேட்டு, 'ஆழ்வார் திருவுள்ளத்தை அடியொற்றி அவர் போனவழியே போம் படியே!' என்ன, 'ஆ, ஆ, பின்னோ, ஆழ்வார்க்கும் எனக்கும் வாசி புத்தி பண்ணிற்றில்லையோ? கிராமகார்யஞ் செய்து இடையிலே இதுவுஞ் செய்ய வேண்டிற்றே எனக்கு' என்றான்.

According to this reference, this Brahmarāya showed his gloss to Nañjiyar and Nampillai, and thus belonged to the first-half of the 13th cent; as the Brahmarāya is referred to as Karikālacola Brahmarāya, we may assign him to the reigns of Rājādhirāja II and Kulottunga III, A.D. 1163-1216, both of whom were known as Karikālacolas (See Prof. K. A. Nilakantha Sastri, The Colas, Vol. II.)

11. Sri M. Venkataramayya drew my attention to these two inscriptions.

12. Arrangements are being made for publishing the commentary of Uḍāli Varadarāja.

## SOME TENETS OF ISLAM

By

S. MUHAMMAD HUSAYN NAINAR

*Head of the Department of Arabic, Persian and Urdu.*

### PREFACE.

The chief object of the following pages is to present to the reader some tenets of Islam. The writer set before himself certain topics and tried to find out what Islam has to say on these; namely: Islam—its significance, idea of religion, idea of brotherhood, exhortation to unity, sectarianism, creed and code of Islam, duty of man, toleration, etc. He has attempted to find out an answer to these topics from the teachings of the Quran, and the Traditions of the Prophet.

No better expression can be given to these ideas than the original language in which they are expressed, but as the object is to approach all those who are not acquainted with Arabic, they are conveyed in English without further attempting to paraphrase them.



## SOME TENETS OF ISLAM

### *Islam.*

Amr ibn Abasa once asked the Prophet, "What is Islam?" The Prophet replied "Purity of speech and hospitality". Then he asked, 'What is Faith?' He said, "Patience and beneficence".

Abu Umama relates: A man said, "O Prophet of Allah! What is the mark of Faith?" The Prophet said, "When thy good work gives thee pleasure and thy evil work grieves thee, thou art a man of faith." The man asked, "What is sin". The Prophet said, "When anything smites thee within thyself, forsake it".

It is clear from the above description that the faith of Islam is not a question of words; it is deeds which decide.

### *Islam: its significance*

Islam is a word which is formed from the root *salama*. It means: *to be tranquil, to be at rest, to have done one's duty, to have paid up, to be at perfect peace, and finally to surrender oneself to Him with Whom peace is made.* The noun derived from it means: *peace, greeting, safety, salvation.* The word thus implies absolute submission to God's will, striving after righteousness with one's own strength. But it does not mean *fatalism* as it is wrongly understood by some. It is not that absolute and blind submission which it came to mean at later times, but rather being at peace, and living in accordance with God's words and commands by leading the life of a righteous man.

The Prophet of Islam regarded religion as a straight natural law for men to follow, wherein was no perplexity or ambiguity. He even taught that all children of men would follow the same straight path were it not for the corrupting influences of their guardians, who consciously or unconsciously set a wrong example for their little folks to follow. According to him the religion was the natural bent of a free, unbiased mind. Man is the vicegerent of God on earth in a real sense, for says Allāh: "Behold, thy Lord said to the angels! 'I will create a vicegerent on earth'".<sup>1</sup>

Man is inspired to know the good and refuse the evil. This is his true nature. But as he is caught in the cob-web of customs, superstitions, selfish desires and false teaching he chooses deliberately the lower and the wrong road and approximates himself to the lowest brute. The Quran enjoins on men not to deflect from the right path in the following verse.

"So set thou thy face steadily and truly to the Faith. Establish God's handiwork according to the pattern on which He has made mankind. Let there be no change in the work wrought by God. That is the standard religion. But most among mankind do not understand".<sup>2</sup>

Early in Islam, the Prophet did away with the baptismal and all other ceremonies in the hands of a designing priesthood. Quran says:

"The Baptism of God: And who can baptize better than God? And it is He whom we worship".<sup>3</sup>

— That the religion of Islam stands for freedom from all mysteries and faith on dubious subjects is learnt from the following verse:

"Wert thou to follow the common run of those on earth, they will lead thee away from the way of God. They follow nothing but conjecture; they do nothing but lie".<sup>4</sup>

That the religion of the former prophets was not a creed-bound dogma but a life of earnest faithful work is emphasised thus by the Quran:

"Abraham was not a Jew nor yet a Christian; but he was true in Faith, and bowed his will to God's (which is Islam) and he joined not gods with God".<sup>5</sup>

According to the Prophet Muhammad (on him be peace) men were originally of one religion which he names Islam. When differences arose among men, God raised prophets in their midst to guide them with truth, and people only differed among themselves out of mere jealousy. The Quran says:

2. Chapter XXX—30.

3. Ch. II—138.

4. Ch. VI: 116.

5. Ch. III: 67.

"Mankind was one single nation, and God sent messengers with glad tidings and warnings, and with them He sent the book in Truth to judge between people in matters wherein they differed; but the People of the Book, after the clear signs came to them, did not differ among themselves except through selfish contumacy".<sup>6</sup>

It may be observed that Islam was the Religion existing from the beginning. In course of time as the wave of propaganda flowed in distant ages and humanity split up into innumerable sections and scattered throughout the world, this same message of wisdom and truth was conveyed to every people in every age in their own tongues, through an endless succession of prophets and seers. Hence it will be seen that Islam is not a new religion. Its only work lies in restoring the primitive faiths of the prophets and preachers of bygone ages to their original purity and simplicity. It is not for the Muslims to ignore any of the greatest teachers who have long since done their work and retired from the world. He dare not utter a word of disrespect towards them. On the contrary he is bound to pay greatest respect to each of these prophets who have appeared in the different ages of the history of mankind. The Quran says:

"We have sent thee inspiration, as We sent it to Noah and the Messengers after him. We sent inspiration to Abraham, Ismail, Isaac, Jacob, and the Tribes, to Jesus, Job, Jonah, Aaron, and Solomon, and to David We gave the Psalms. Of some apostles we have already told thee the story; of others we have not, and to Moses God spoke direct".<sup>7</sup>

### *Sectarianism condemned*

God's teaching, in the sense of Islam, is one in all ages. It is wrong to claim a monopoly for His message. It is the same for all peoples and in all times. So all prophets who came with God's message in different periods form one brotherhood; their religion and teaching are one. They serve the One True God, Who loves and cherishes them, and they owe their duty to Him. This idea is brought out in the following verse of the Quran:

"O ye Apostles! enjoy all things good and pure and work righteousness, for I am well acquainted with all that ye do. And

6. Ch. II: 213.

7. Ch. IV: 163-164.

verily this brotherhood of yours is a single brotherhood, and I am your Lord and Cherisher. Therefore fear me and no other".<sup>8</sup>

The people of narrower views, who came later and traded on the earlier names, have broken up the Message and Brotherhood into various camps and sects, and God is aware of their doings are conveyed in the following verses:

"But later generations cut off their affair of unity one from another: yet will they all return to us".<sup>9</sup>

"As for those who divide their religion and break up into sects, thou hast no part in them in the least: Their affair is with God. He will in the end tell them the truth of all that they did".<sup>10</sup>

### *Creed of Islam*

The creed of Islam is to believe in the One Universal God, in the message given to Muslims through the Prophet Muhammad, and the message delivered by other prophets to different nations in the past. Quran says:

"Say ye: 'We believe in God, and the revelation given to us, and to Abraham, Ismail, Isaac, Jacob and the Tribes, and that given to Moses and Jesus, and that given to all Prophets from their Lord. We make no difference between one and another of them and we bow to God in Islam'.<sup>11</sup>

The Teachers who came before the Prophet of Islam are mentioned in the above verse, in three groups. (1) Abraham, Ismail, Isaac, Jacob and the Tribes. Of these Abraham had a Book and the others followed his tradition. (2) Moses and Jesus, who each had left a scripture; these scriptures are still extant and (3) other scriptures, prophets or messengers of God, are not specifically mentioned in the Quran. No difference is made between any of these. Their message in essentials, was one, and that is the basis of Islam.

God sent messengers of His Truth to every people. Names of some of these are known to us through the holy Quran while a large number of these names are not made known to us through that medium. This fact is mentioned in the following verse.

8. Ch. XXIII. 51-52.

9. Ch. XXI: 93.

10. VI: 159.

11. Ch. II: 136.

"We did aforetime send apostles before thee: of them there are some whose story we have related to thee, and some whose story we have not related to thee. ....".<sup>12</sup>

### *Idea of Brotherhood*

In Islam all humanity is one vast brotherhood, with God as their Creator and Master who looks upon them all as equal. All the barriers, racial and other, raised against it by the self-interest of man are destroyed and divisions on the ground of religion merely are not recognised. Its teachings are directly opposed to all sectarianism and based on the broadest principle. This idea is conveyed by the following verse of the Quran.

"O mankind! we created you from a single pair of a male and a female and made you into nations and tribes, that you may know each other. Verily the most honoured of you in the sight of God is he who is the most righteous of you. And God has full knowledge and is well acquainted with all things".<sup>13</sup>

There are many sayings of the Prophet which convey this message of brotherhood. The Prophet has said:

"God looked towards the people of this earth. The Arabs hated non-Arabs except the best among them of the people of the Book. He says: I have only raised thee up that I may prove thee and prove others by thee."

"Be ye all worshippers of God and brothers to one another, as God has commanded you."

### *Exhortation to Unity*

An appeal for reconciliation and co-operation in the matter of truth is thus made by the Quran:

"Say: will you dispute with us about God, seeing that He is our Lord and your Lord; that we are responsible for our doings and you for yours, and that we are sincere in our faith in Him".<sup>13a</sup>

"Say: O People of the Book! come to common terms as between us and you: that we worship none but God; that we

12. Ch. XL: 78.

13. Ch. XLIX: 13.

13a. Ch. II: 139.

associate no partners with Him; that we erect not, from among ourselves, Lords and patrons other than God".<sup>14</sup>

*Exclusiveness not approved*

Every race which is imbued with race arrogance, resorts to moral or religious subterfuge. Even if its members are usually honest or just among themselves, they are contemptuous of those outside their circle and cheat and deceive them without qualms of conscience. The Quran condemns it as a 'lie against God' in the following verse:

"Among the People of the Book are some who, if entrusted with a hoard of gold, will readily pay it back; others, who, if entrusted with a single silver coin will not repay it unless thou constantly stoorest demanding, because, they say, 'there is no call on us to keep faith with these ignorant Pagans.' But they tell a lie against God, and they know it".<sup>15</sup>

Sometimes those who act unjustly towards their circle justify themselves by their Law. This attitude is criticised by the following verse of the Quran.

"There is among them a section who distort the Book with their tongues. As they read, you would think it is a part of the Book, but it is no part of the Book; and they say, 'That is from God,' but it is not from God; it is they who tell a lie against God and they know it".<sup>16</sup>

It may be observed that to a Muslim this wide world presents a vast field for co-operation in the struggle of life towards its ultimate goal. His religion leads him to seek the welfare of humanity in the co-operative spirit as it were rather than in the competitive. He might have no objection in treating with a non-Muslim unless he is checked by the peculiar caste rules of the people with whom he desires to approach. Thus it is a practical brotherhood of man that knows no colour and makes men meet on the common platform of humanity.

The following verses of the Quran shuts out all wrangling upon religion.

14. Ch. III: 64.

15. Ch. III: 75.

16. Ch. III: 78.

"The Jews say: 'The Christians have naught to stand upon.' and the Christians say: 'The jews have naught to stand upon.' Yet they profess to study the same Book. Like unto their word is what those say who know not; but God will Judge between them in their quarrel on the day of judgment".<sup>17</sup>

"They Say: Become Jews or Christians if you would be guided to salvation." Say thou: Nay! I would rather the religion of Abraham the True, and he joined not gods with God".<sup>17a</sup>

"And they say: 'None shall enter paradise unless he be a Jew or a Christian.' Those are their vain desires. Say: 'Produce your proof if you are truthful.' Nay. whoever submits his whole self to God and is a doer of good,—he will get his reward with his Lord, on such shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve".<sup>18</sup>

#### *Code of Islam*

The code of Islam is thus given in the Quran:

"Say: Come, I will rehearse what God hath really prohibited you from: Join not anything as equal with him; be good to your parents; kill not your children on a plea of want; we provide sustenance for you and for them. Come not near to, shameful deeds, whether open or secret; take not life which God hath made sacred, except by way of justice and law. Thus doth He command you that you may learn wisdom".

"And come not near to the orphan's property except to improve it, until he attains the age of full strength; give measure and weight with full justice;—No burden do we place on any soul, but that which it can bear;—whenever you speak, speak justly even if a near relative is concerned; and fulfil the covenant of God. Thus doth He command you that you may remember".

"Verily, this is my way leading straight: follow it: follow not other paths: they will scatter you about from His great path. Thus doth He command you that you may be righteous".<sup>19</sup>

17. Ch. II: 113.

17a. Ch. II: 135.

18. Ch. II: 111-112.

19. Ch. VI: 151-153.

This was the life according to the original religion and whosoever broke from it he was regarded as 'going astray'. In the Quran such people are called 'unjust people' and 'transgressors', and 'those who do wrong, follow their lusts without knowledge'.

### *Responsibility of Man*

Every man is responsible for his own deeds. The righteous have the duty to protect themselves from the temptation and to proclaim God's truth in all circumstances. All deeds have their consequences, good or ill. God will not treat the good and evil alike. He does not sit apart, He governs the world. Mercy and justice are His attributes. In His justice every deed or word or thought of evil has its consequence for the doer, speaker or thinker. The Quran says:

"Yea, to God belongs all that is in the Heavens and on earth: so that He rewards those who do evil, according to their deeds, and He rewards those who do good with what is best".<sup>20</sup>

"Shall we treat those who believe and work deeds of righteousnesses, the same as those who do mischief on earth? Shall we treat those who guard against evil the same as those who turn aside from the right?"<sup>21</sup>

"Leave alone those who take their religion to be mere play and amusement, and are deceived by the life of this world. But proclaim to them this truth: that every soul delivers itself to ruin by its own acts. It will find for itself no protector or intercessor except God; if it offered every ransom none will be accepted. Such is the end of those who deliver themselves to ruin by their own acts.....".<sup>22</sup>

### *Service to fellow beings*

In Islam service to men and works for the good of humanity constitute pre-eminently the service and worship of God.

The Prophet of Islam has said:

"All creation is the family of God, and of all creation the most beloved of God is he who does most good to His family."

20. Ch. LIII: 31.

21. Ch. XXXVIII: 28.

22. Ch. VI: 70.



"God will not be merciful to him who is not merciful to men. The All-merciful God is merciful to those who are merciful. Be ye then merciful to those who are on the earth so that He Who is in the heaven may be merciful to you".

"God is always ready to help His worshipper so long as the worshipper is ready to help his brother."

"A selfless life of love is the life of a Muslim".

"When the Prophet was asked what constitutes the best part of Faith, he replied: 'That thou love for the sake of God, and hate for the sake of God, that thou love for men what thou lovest for thyself, and hate for them what thou hatest for thyself'".

"You will not be a believer unless you love one another."

"By Him in Whose hand my life is, no worshipper becomes a true believer until he loves for his brother what he loves for himself."

The path of charity or unselfish love is the difficult path, and the Quran gives in the following verses three instances for our understanding.

"Have we not made for him a pair of eyes, and a tongue and a pair of lips and shown him the two high ways? But he hath made no haste on the path that is steep. And what will explain to thee the path that is steep? It is: freeing the bondmen, or the giving of food in a day of privation to the orphan with claims of relationship or to the indigent down in the dust. Then will he be of those who believe and enjoin patience, deeds of kindness and compensation".<sup>23</sup>

The three instances mentioned in the above verses are (1) freeing the bondmen, (2) feeding the orphans and (3) feeding the indigent down in the dust. As regards the bondmen, we are to understand not only reference to legal slavery which is now extinct in all civilised lands, but many other kinds of slavery which are found, especially in civilized societies. There is political slavery, industrial slavery and social slavery. There is also the slavery of conventions, of ignorance, and of superstition. The good man tries to liberate men and women from all kinds of slavery.

The essence of religion, according to Islam, is the service to afflicted humanity. True worship does not consist in the mere form

of prayer without the heart and the mind being earnestly applied to seek the realisation of the presence of God, and to understand and do His holy will. In brief, work alone is the true test of a believer in the sight of God. The following verses of the Quran make these points clear.

“Seest thou one who denies the judgment to come? Then such is the man who repulses the orphan with harshness, and encourages not the feeding of the indigent. So woe to the worshippers who are neglectful of their prayers, those who want but to be seen of men but refuse to supply even neighbourly needs”.<sup>24</sup>

### *Work and Charity*

Mere lip profession of faith is not enough. It must be tried and tested in the real turmoil of life. The Quran says:

“Do men think that they will be left alone on saying, ‘we believe’ and that they will not be tested? We did test those before them and God will certainly know those who are true from those who are false”.<sup>25</sup>

“God has purchased of the believers their persons and their goods”.<sup>26</sup>

“By no means shall you attain righteousness unless you give freely of that which you love, and whatever you give of a truth God knoweth it well”.<sup>27</sup>

It may be understood from the above verses that in the divine bargain of God with man, God takes man’s will and soul, and his wealth and goods, and gives him in return everlasting felicity.

Charity in Islam embraces also the widest circle of kindness and it is exacting in the minutest concerns of life. Prophet says:

“Every good act is charity. Smiling in thy brother’s face, bidding what is good, forbidding what is wrong—all these are acts of charity.” Showing the way to a stranger, assisting a blind man, removing stones, thorns and bones from the road also are charitable acts.

24. Ch. CVII: 1-7.

25. Ch. XXIX: 2-3.

26. Ch. IX: 111.

27. Ch. III: 92.

*Duty of Man*

Duty of man is prescribed in the following verses of the Quran.

"God commands justice, the doing of good and liberality to kith and kin and He forbids all shameful deeds and injustice and rebellion".<sup>28</sup>

".....Help ye one another in righteousness and piety, but help ye not one another in sin and rancour. Fear God, for God is strict in punishment".<sup>29</sup>

"O ye who believe! Stand out firmly for God, as witnesses to fair dealing, and let not the hatred of others to you make you swerve to wrong and depart from justice. Be just: that is next to piety: and fear God. For God is well-acquainted with all that ye do".<sup>30</sup>

"Say: The things that my Lord has indeed forbidden are: shameful deeds, whether open or secret; sins and tresspasses against truth or reason; assigning of partners to God, for which He hath given no authority; and saying things about God of which you have no knowledge".<sup>31</sup>

The Prophet has said:

"When one of you sees wrong-doing let him undo it with his hand and if he cannot do this, then let him speak against it with his tongue and if he cannot do this either, then let him abhor it with his heart."

"By Him in Whose hand rests my life! bid what is reasonable and forbid what is wrong or He will certainly send against you a chastisement, then will you call on Him and He will not answer you."

*Toleration*

Quran lays stress on the fact that there is no need to persecute or abuse any one for his faith or belief.

"Say: O ye that reject Faith! I worship not that which ye worship, nor will ye worship that which I worship. And I will not

28. Ch. XVI: 90.

29. Ch. V: 3.

30. Ch. V: 9.

31. Ch. VII: 33.

worship that which ye have been wont to worship, nor will ye worship that which I worship. To you be your way and to me mine".<sup>32</sup>

The above verses define the right attitude to those who reject Faith. Although we can make no compromise in matters of Truth, yet we cannot, for that reason, persecute others for their belief or faith.

The Quran also appeals to the humanity at large to sink their petty differences in the following verses.

"To every people have we appointed rites and ceremonies which they must follow. Let them not then dispute with thee on the matter .....".<sup>33</sup>

".....To each among you have we prescribed a Law and an Open Way. If God had so willed, He would have made you a single People, but His plan is to test you in what He hath given you. So strive as in a race in all virtues. The goal of you all is to God. It is He that will show you the truth of the matters in which ye dispute".<sup>34</sup>

32. Ch. CIX: 1-6.

33. Ch. XXII: 67.

34. Ch. V: 51.



## INDIAN AIR TRAINING CORPS

### THE ROYAL ROAD TO THE INDIAN AIR FORCE

The Indian Air Force is, at present, passing through a period of expansion and requires in increasing numbers the best representatives of the youth of the country. The formation at Universities in India of the Indian Air Training Corps is designed to instil air-mindedness into that section of the youth of the country, which is educated up to the required I.A.F. Standards, and to hold before them the prospect of a definite career in the I.A.F.

The Scheme, by giving entrants a solid grounding in Air Force subjects, will give them a greater ability to absorb their subsequent service training.

### GENERAL POLICY

All matters of policy will be decided by Air Headquarters (India) who will also be responsible for the issue of the syllabus of training.

### FORMATION AND ORGANISATION

The Indian Air Training Corps will form a part of the University organisation. Application for the formation of an I.A.T.C. at each University Centre will be made by the Vice-Chancellor of the University concerned. On this application being accepted and after the organisation of the scheme has been put into effect, the administration and control of the training will become the responsibility of the Vice-Chancellor. This will be in all other than policy matters. He will be assisted by Air Headquarters (India) who will also be represented in the area to which the University belongs by a F/Lt. I.A.F. specifically detailed for this purpose.

### INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

The instructional staff will be drawn from the teaching staff of the University. Sufficient staff for the instruction of the courses formed at the University will be selected by the Vice-Chancellor. Instructors will go through a short course in technical and non-technical subjects, at an Air Force Centre. They will receive T. A. to and from these units at the rate applicable for 2nd Grade Officers. During the period of the Course they will be provided with accommodation and messing on the scale admissible to officer cadets.

## EXPLANATION

- (i) Briefly the scheme is to institute at Universities special Air Force Classes at which students will be taught the organisation of Air Forces, the theory of Flight, the working of the internal combustion engine, aircraft recognition, non-technical subjects like writing of official letters, elementary principles of Book-keeping, together with some Air Force drill and physical training. The Course will be an optional subject added to the normal curriculum of the University. It will last for a total period of three months consisting of an initial and an elementary course. During the period of these courses, trainees will receive a stipend of Rs. 20 p.m. with a free issue of uniforms with distinctive arm and cap badges. Uniforms will be worn during all periods of I.A.T.C. instruction.
- (ii) All prospective entrants will be required to appear before a Selection Board consisting of the Vice-Chancellor of the University, the Senior I.A.T.C. Instructor at the University and the I.A.F. Officer assigned to that area. They will also undergo a medical examination by the University Medical Authorities prior to their acceptance as trainees. Entrants below the age of 17½ years at the beginning of the Course next following their application for admission will not be accepted.
- (iii) Examination will be held at the end of both Initial and Elementary Courses. Trainees failing to pass the first examination will be required to resign from the I.A.T.C.
- (iv) On the successful completion of both courses trainees will receive a suitable diploma.
- (v) Successful trainees will in the first instance be taken into the service as aircraftmen second class.

The Scheme, as it stands at present, takes recruits into the ranks. Airmen, however, with power of leadership, intelligence and integrity will have every chance later of rising to commissioned ranks.

The information given in this pamphlet is not exhaustive and details are liable to change from time to time. Up-to-date information may be had from the Directorate of Training, Air Headquarters, India, New Delhi. This publication should not be quoted as an authority.

## REVIEW

The Āgamaśāstra of Gauḍapāda, edited, translated and annotated by Prof. Vidhusekhar Bhattacharya, Asutosh Professor of Sanskrit, University of Calcutta; published by the University of Calcutta, 1943. Price.

The Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣat-kārikās of Gauḍapāda are well known to students of Sanskrit literature and they form one of the most prominent texts in Advaita Vedānta Literature. Prof. Vidhusekhar Bhattacharya, who is a great Sanskrit Scholar and one of the greatest among the authorities in Buddhism and who has mastered Tibetan and Chinese, has now interpreted the Kārikās of Gauḍapāda in the light of the Buddhistic literature with which it has very intimate affiliations. According to the orthodox tradition, there is a controversy about the first chapter of this work; what part of this is the Upaniṣad is a question on which the different schools of Vedānta differ. It contains twelve prose passages and twenty nine verses. After examining this problem, the author enters the more interesting and the more important problem of the nature of the work. Now it is accepted as a single composite work. But after a very masterly examination of the evidences available he comes to the conclusion that the four Chapters of the work must be taken as four separate independent works originally, later on taken up as a single book. He does not accept the view advanced by some that the work only represents a philosophy current in the Gauḍa country and concludes that Gauḍapāda is a person. His time is estimated as much earlier than what is accepted by tradition. Śaṅkara is taken as the disciple's disciple of Gauḍapāda and as having lived in the end of the eighth and beginning of the ninth centuries and as such Gauḍapāda cannot be earlier than the beginning of the eighth century. But by comparison with Buddhistic works, it is established that the date must be at least two centuries earlier. There is a very clear presentation of the philosophy of Gauḍapāda and its relation with the Vijñānavāda school of Buddhism. These are the more important points that are dealt with in the Introduction covering one hundred and fourteen pages. It is not possible to consider all such points in a review, not even to indicate the general conclusions and the main arguments that have led the author to such conclusions. After this very learned Introduction, the text of the Kārikās is given in



Roman transliteration with an English translation. Critical notes and explanations follow. In these Notes, the author has compared the text with the traditional interpretations and also with Buddhist Literature. It is true that many of the explanations go directly against orthodox views.

As a sample of his bold and original views I may cite his explanations of the first four verses in the fourth chapter of the book. In the Introduction he definitely says that far from the fourth chapter being a refutation of the tenets of Buddhism, the chapter agrees with the tenets of Buddhism in certain fundamentals. Thus after a very long and learned series of arguments he comes to the conclusion that the prayer in the first verse of the chapter is to Buddha and not to Nārāyaṇa as Śaṅkara tries to make out. The explanations of the next three verses are equally new in outlook and approach, and it is certain that his explanations will shock many an orthodox student of Vedānta.

The book concludes with various appendices, namely the text of the Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad, the index of verses in the Kārikās, index of words, index of words having special Buddhist significances etc.

It is not possible, nor is it proper, for one to start with a discussion on the various controversial points dealt with in the book. No one can fail to be impressed by the thorough way in which the whole book has been studied and presented in this edition. And to students who pay more heed to logic than they pay homage to tradition and settled tenets, among whom I consider myself as one, the book is a real eye-opener for new methods of approach to text criticism. Scholars of indology and religions and especially students of Sanskrit and Vedic religion owe a deep debt of gratitude to the great professor for the work he has done and for making the work available to every one who is interested in the subject through this publication. The Calcutta University deserves congratulations on bringing out such a scholarly work.

C. K. R.

## UNIVERSITY NOTES

Mr. Sreepada Lakshmipathi Sastri, Junior Lecturer in Telugu, has retired from service from the beginning of this Academic Year. He was to retire from service in October 1942, on having attained his 55th year, but was granted extension till the end of that Academic Year. He is an old type Pandit, who has studied according to the traditional method under able teachers in the Godavari District. Before joining the Oriental Research Institute of the University of Madras, he worked as the Manager of the Office of the Suryaraya Nighantu, a Telugu Lexicon, started under the direction and patronage of the Maharajah of Pithapuram. He has edited here some old unpublished works in Telugu and published a critique on Nannecchoda Deva's Kumarasambhava. He has also prepared a new edition of this Kumarasambhava which is now in the press, and worked at Comparative Dravidian Prosody.

K. R.

N.B.—Since writing the above we received the sad news that Mr. Sastri expired on 11-11-43. We offer our condolences to the bereaved family.

*Editor.*



## LIST OF EXCHANGES

1. *Prabuddha Karnataka, Mysore (Kannada).*
2. *Visvabharati Quarterly, Santiniketan, Bengal.*
3. *Editor, Tamil Pozhil (Tamil).*
4. *The Nagari Pracharani Sabha, Benares (Hindi).*
5. *The Indian Culture, Calcutta.*
6. *The Indian Historical Quarterly, Calcutta.*
7. *The Royal Asiatic Society, Bengal (Calcutta).*
8. *Planters' Gazette and Annual, Calcutta.*
9. *Bharatiya Vidya, Andheri, Bombay.*
10. *The Journal of the Mythic Society, Bangalore.*
11. *Sri Venkateshwara Oriental Institute, Tirupathi.*
12. *The Journal of the Tanjore Sarasvathi Mahal Library.*
13. *The Madras Agricultural Journal.*
14. *The S.P. Traimasikam (Malayalam).*



